THE ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW

FOURTH SERIES.—VOL. VII.—(XXXVII).—NOVEMBER, 1907.—No. 5.

THE APPOINTMENT OF A GREEK BISHOP IN THE UNITED STATES.

SOMETIME before 1890 a number of Ruthenian priests in the United States had addressed to the S. Congregation of the Propaganda a petition in which they set forth the difficulties of administering to the spiritual needs of the Ruthenian Catholics, owing to the impossibility of coming to an understanding with the American authorities of the Latin rite who alone held jurisdiction in the States. The petitioners therefore solicited the establishment of a separate Apostolic Vicariate, through which the priests of the Greek rite might obtain the necessary faculties for the exercise of their ministry.

Before considering Rome's answer to this request, it is necessary to state that the lack of harmonious action between the bishops of the United States and the clergy of the Greek rite in communion with the Holy See, arose partly from the novelty of the situation suddenly brought about by the large influx from Austria-Hungary of immigrants who had a liturgy obviously different from the Roman liturgy, and an ecclesiastical discipline which appeared to depart somewhat from the accepted canons of Apostolic tradition as interpreted in the Latin Church. The fact that some of the Greek priests who claim doctrinal allegiance to Rome and jurisdictional dependence upon the Holy See, were married men; that they ignored the ecclesiastical authorities in America, and claimed

the right of exercising pastoral faculties under a title granted them by their former Ordinaries in Europe, caused a protest on the part of the American bishops against the introduction of a foreign rite into a country to whose population such novelty would be a source of confusion.

The Holy See was therefore fully aware of the difficulties on both sides. Prudent measures were needed to obviate misunderstandings and complications. To require the abandonment in America of the traditional liturgy of the Greek Uniates would be to ignore both the strong hold which national devotion has upon the common people, and, considering their number and their helplessness from the religious point of view, it would be unjust to deny them a liberty of worship which was the source of the independence and prosperity enjoyed by the Catholics of the United States in the exercise of their religion.

The first step toward the amelioration of the conditions complained of was an Instruction addressed by the Holy See to the Austro-Hungarian bishops, demanding that they recall at once to their original jurisdiction all the married priests who had settled in the United States. None but the celibate priest was hereafter to be sent to the American dioceses. This decree was issued in October, 1890.

Some months later, in May, 1892, the bishops of the United States were advised of the above measure, and also of the obligation imposed on missionary priests of the Greek rite who came to America, to present themselves to the Latin Ordinary of the locality in which they wished to exercise pastoral functions, so as to obtain from him the necessary faculties and instructions. They were to be subject to the local bishop as long as they served in the capacity of missionaries in the United States.[1]

Simultaneously with these proceedings arrangements were being made to effect practical measures whereby the local hierarchy would be enabled to control the Greek people who had no priest of their own rite to administer to them, so that they might be served by the Latin clergy. In 1894 Leo XIII

[1] Letter of Card. Ledochowski to Card. Gibbons, 10 May, 1892.

issued a decree which laid down certain rules to facilitate communication between Greek and Latin Catholics in worship and in the administration of the Sacraments.[2] Later on, 1 May, 1897, there was issued another instruction, which still further extended the privileges of intercommunion; it practically permitted all Greek Catholics to conform to the Latin rite while resident in America. At the same time the Holy See urged upon the Latin bishops within whose dioceses large numbers of Greek, and especially Ruthenian, Catholics were to be found, that they delegate some able and trustworthy member of the Ruthenian clergy or a Latin priest likely to be acceptable to them, to act as the bishop's vicar and pastoral representative in matters pertaining to the administration of their affairs. Such has been the status of ecclesiastical legislation concerning the Greek Catholics in the United States up to very recent times.

Owing to what must appear as a want of energetic or intelligent coöperation with the Holy See on the part of some of our clergy, numerous defections have occurred, taking thousands of Catholics into the Russian Schismatic Church. In many cases, too, Oriental priests, acting like adventurers anxious to enrich themselves, have established independent congregations, exercising faculties without right or jurisdiction on the one hand, and without let or hindrance, for fear of popular disturbances, on the other. Probably the largest proportion of these Catholics belong to the Slav nation, known as Ruthenians. A new phase of ecclesiastical administration has just been entered upon, in their behalf, by the publication of a document appointing a bishop who is to exercise vicarious jurisdiction and to safeguard the ecclesiastical rights of Ruthenian Greek Catholics in the United States.

The Establishment of a Ruthenian Bishop for the United States.

By the Apostolic Letter *Ea semper*,[3] Pius X places all

[2] This decree was simply an extension of the regulations issued by Benedict XIV in his Constitution *Demandatam*, 24 December, 1743, for Greek Melchites of the Turkish dominion.

[3] See "Analecta" of this number, pp. 512 ff.

Catholics of the Ruthenian (Greek) rite, resident in the United States, under the care and direction of a bishop of the same rite, who is to receive his jurisdiction from the Ordinaries in whose dioceses he is to perform his ministrations. The Letter, under date of 14 June, the feast of St. Basil the Great, Patriarch of the Eastern Church, is addressed to the Apostolic Delegate, the Most Rev. Diomede Falconio, who is to communicate the same to the members of the hierarchy, and on whom devolves the supervision of its faithful observance in all cases. In a brief introduction the Sovereign Pontiff sets forth the motive which prompted the document, and expresses the confident hope that its observance will produce salutary effects, tending to true union in faith and charity. Then follow an exposition of the offices of the newly-appointed bishop, and the code of laws to be observed in the relations of the bishop with the clergy and people. These laws are set forth in thirty-six articles, grouped under four heads: Position of the Ruthenian Bishop; Functions of the Ruthenian Clergy; Relations of the Ruthenian Laity to the Clergy and *vice versa*; Intermarriage of Ruthenian and Latin Catholics.

The Position of the Ruthenian Bishop.

The Ruthenian bishop is appointed directly by the Holy See, without intervention, at present, of the votes of the American bishops or the clergy. In the same manner he receives his primary jurisdiction immediately from Rome. Hence, although the exercise of that jurisdiction in different dioceses depends upon the consent of the local Ordinary, the Ruthenian bishop renders the account of his administration to the Apostolic Delegate as the representative of the Holy See. In like manner the Apostolic Delegate becomes the regular interpreter and custodian of the rights accorded to the Ruthenian bishop through the Ordinaries. Accordingly, all cases of contention or doubt that may arise in the exercise of the new bishop's functions, are to be referred for arbitration and settlement to the Delegate, who is on the ground and capable of familiarizing himself with the circumstances and interests involved

in the complaint. There remains, of course, the right of appeal to the immediate authority of Rome; but, until the Holy See shall have reversed the former decision, it shall remain in actual force.

The episcopal functions which the Ruthenian bishop is empowered to exercise, tend toward the maintenance, in its original integrity, of the Oriental (Ruthenian) rite. He is to consecrate the Sacred Oils for the use of the Ruthenian clergy, to dedicate their churches, administer the Sacrament of Confirmation, and generally to officiate at solemn pontificals in the Ruthenian rite. It is his duty also to ordain clerics of the Ruthenian Church, provided the latter are duly furnished with dimissorial letters from the Ordinary to whose local jurisdiction they belong.

The Ruthenian bishop is commissioned likewise to make regular and canonical visitations to the parishes and missions of his rite. For this he must obtain a written permission from each of the Ordinaries whose dioceses he visits and from whom he obtains the requisite faculties for the exercise of his jurisdiction, whether it be instructive or corrective. According to pontifical prescription,[4] these canonical visitations should take place annually or at least every other year. On these occasions the rectors of churches are bound to present a detailed account of their administration, particularly of the income and the condition of property belonging to the mission. The receipts of moneys for the church are to be credited to the congregation, and to be kept distinct from the salary and perquisites of the pastor. All titles of church property are to be consigned to the Ordinary or to trustees of whom the Ordinary approves. The result of these visitations is to be communicated to the bishop in whose diocese they have taken place, by way of a report upon the moral and economic standing of the Ruthenian parishes. Apart from this, the Ruthenian bishop is obliged to make an accurate and complete triennial report concerning the moral and material status of

[4] Council of Trent, Sess. XXIV, 3; Bened. XIV, Syn. IV, 3, 3.

the Ruthenian parishes in the United States, to the Apostolic Delegate, who is to transmit the same to the S. Congregation of the Propaganda.

The salary of the Ruthenian bishop is to be supplied in a manner similar to that of the *cathedraticum*, that is to say, by a proportionate taxation of the different Ruthenian communities for whose benefit the Ruthenian bishop acts. Ordinarily the rules laid down in the respective diocesan statutes for the maintenance of the episcopal dignity are to be observed. The Ruthenian bishop's residence, for the time being, is to be in Philadelphia.

Status of the Ruthenian Clergy.

The priests who minister at present to the Ruthenian faithful are almost exclusively emigrants from Austria-Hungary. In future their places are to be filled from the ranks of candidates educated in America, either in theological seminaries of their own rite, or (so long as such seminaries have not been established) in the Latin seminaries of the American dioceses in which they were born or have acquired domicile. Only such candidates as take the vow of celibacy will be henceforth admitted to ordination in the United States. The Ruthenian bishop is required, nevertheless, to take active measures, in concert with the Apostolic Delegate and the various Ordinaries concerned, for the establishment of Ruthenian theological seminaries.

In the meantime pastoral vacancies in the Ruthenian mission are to be filled by such Ruthenian priests as may be found suitable within the diocese where the vacancy exists. If a bishop has no Ruthenian priest capable of assuming the responsibility, he may apply to any other bishop who can supply the need from the ranks of his own clergy. If all efforts to supply a Ruthenian priest from the American missions fail, the S. Congregation of the Propaganda is to be notified and it will take the responsibility of sending a priest. In respect of the qualifications necessary on the part of the Ruthenian priest not ordained in America for assuming pastoral

charge, the Sovereign Pontiff ordains that he be a celibate, or at least a widower without children, of untainted reputation, zeal, and piety, and sufficiently intelligent and cultured, a true priest, *lucri non cupidus*, that is, not making of his priestly calling a business to enrich himself; and, lastly, free from any attachment to political factions.

Every Ruthenian priest who is called to assume missionary work in the United States must obtain from the S. Congregation of the Propaganda a letter permitting his going to America and specifying the particular Ruthenian mission to which he is to go. All such priests, although they remain perpetually incardinated in the diocese from which they come, receive and exercise their faculties in absolute independence of the Ruthenian Ordinary of the diocese of their origin during the time they spend in missionary work in the United States. They are not at liberty to return to their original diocese at home, without the written consent of the Ordinary in whose diocese they are at the time doing missionary work. If they wish to transfer their pastoral charge from one diocese to another, they need in every case the consent of the Ordinary in whose diocese they are, as well as of the Ordinary to whose jurisdiction they wish to be transferred. They are instructed to inform the Ruthenian bishop also.

Ruthenian students who are candidates for Holy Orders, no matter what may be the place of their birth or domicile, are incardinated in that diocese whose bishop accepts them and at whose hands they take the oath of fidelity and stability in missionary service. If they wish later on to be affiliated to another diocese, they require the consent of their Ordinary as well as that of the bishop into whose diocese they seek adoption. They are to inform the Ruthenian bishop of the change.

Ruthenian priests are removable *ad nutum Ordinarii loci*; but there must be a just and serious cause for the removal, lest it be to the prejudice of the incumbent. Such changes are to be reported to the Ruthenian bishop, presumably at the instance of the Ordinary or through the chancellor. If a priest feel that he is unfairly treated in the removal, he may lodge

an appeal with the Apostolic Delegate at Washington, who is to give his decision within three months from the date of the appeal. In a last instance recourse may be had to the Holy See. But in all such cases of appeal, which are termed *in devolutivo*, the previous judgment stands until it is reversed or amended.

In regard to the salaries, perquisites, and general maintenance of the Ruthenian clergy, the rules laid down by the Third Plenary Council of Baltimore, interpreted by the diocesan statutes, are to be observed in accordance with custom and the judgment of the Ruthenian bishop.

The Relations of the Ruthenian Faithful to the Clergy.

The Ruthenian people who have their own pastors are subject to them and to the regulations of their native rite. As regards feast days and fasts, however, they are free to conform to the legitimate customs of the district in which they happen to dwell. On all Sundays, and on such holidays as are celebrated simultaneously in the Latin and Ruthenian churches, they are bound to conform to their own rite in their own churches, where they have such. On other days, and where they have no priest or church of their own rite or none conveniently near, they should attend worship in the Latin church; but this act does not imply that they abandon their own rite. Any Catholic of the Ruthenian rite may go to confession to a Latin priest, even if there is a Ruthenian priest at hand. The faculties as well as the censures and reservations are the same for Latin and Greek Catholics in the United States.

If, however, the Ruthenian Catholics have acquired an actual and permanent domicile in the United States, and wish to pass over to the Latin rite, they are free to do so; but they must apply to the Holy See for permission; and if they should subsequently return to their own country and feel the need of returning to the old form of worship, they may again apply to the Holy See, and obtain leave to do so.

A priest of the Latin rite who makes any attempt to induce a Ruthenian Catholic to leave his own rite and to become attached to the Latin parish, falls under Apostolic censure *ferendae sententiae.*

MARRIAGES BETWEEN RUTHENIAN AND LATIN CATHOLICS.

Whilst marriages between Ruthenians and Latins are in no wise restricted, the Latin party is bound, under all circumstances, to preserve his or her rite. The Ruthenian wife, on the other hand, is free to adopt the religious rite of her Latin husband, either at the time of their marriage or at any subsequent time. But when she has done so, she is no longer free, during her husband's lifetime, to return to the Greek rite. After his death she may do so. In the matter of fasts and the observance of feast days the Ruthenian wife may always conform to the practice of her Latin husband, even if she does not accept his rite in other respects. In like manner the Ruthenian husband may adopt the Latin rite of his wife, or conform to the practice of the Latin Church in matters of fasting or the observance of feast days. After her death he is free to remain in the Latin rite, or to return to the Ruthenian.

The marriage ceremony in the case of a Latin husband and a Ruthenian wife is invariably performed by the priest of the Latin rite in the Latin church. When the husband belongs to the Ruthenian rite and the wife to the Latin, they are free to celebrate their marriage either in the Ruthenian or in the Latin church, according to the respective rite.

Where husband and wife retain their separate rites, each of them is under the jurisdiction and pastoral care of his or her respective parish priest, who is to administer to the members of his own flock in all such cases as Paschal Communion, Viaticum, and Extreme Unction, Burial Service, unless prompted in case of necessity to assist those of a different rite.

Children born in the United States are to be baptized in the Latin rite if the father is Latin and the mother Ruthenian. If the father is Ruthenian and the mother Latin, the parents are free to have their child baptized either in the Ruthenian, or,

with the consent of the Ruthenian father, in the Latin church, according to the respective rites of these churches. The children come within the jurisdiction of the parish priest according to whose rite they have been legitimately baptized. An exception to this rule is to be observed in cases where baptism in the alien rite was administered under stress of necessity, such as imminent danger of death or the absence of a priest who could administer baptism according to the rite professed by the parents. In these cases the child must be considered as belonging to the rite of its parents, no matter who baptized it.

Such are the principal provisions and regulations made by the Holy See for the spiritual protection of the Ruthenian Catholics in the United States. They are to go into effect immediately, and the appointment of the Right Rev. Ortynski as the first bishop of the Ruthenian rite renders their execution possible. The Apostolic Delegate is especially charged with the promulgation of these regulations, and he is empowered to subdelegate some ecclesiastical official to aid him in the promulgation and observance of the same. Within six months an official report is to be filed by Monsignor Falconio regarding the steps he has taken in this matter, which report is to be forwarded to the S. Congregation of the Propaganda.

This latter requirement is in line with the method pursued under the present Sovereign Pontiff's administration. He makes laws; but he is not satisfied with their mere publication. He insists on their execution, and defines in advance the term when the report of what has actually been done to secure their observance, is to be made to the Holy See. We note the same thing in the reforms commanded for Italy. The visitations of seminaries, the examinations of episcopal curias, the revision of the Roman parish system, the reports required from the bishops regarding the temporal and spiritual administration of religious communities within their jurisdiction—these are steps toward an internal reform which, beginning at Rome, shows every sign of being carried into the wider field of the Universal Church. When the time comes, we shall find that

the progress made toward the introduction of liturgical music, the reform of studies and discipline in the diocesan seminaries, and the correction of abuses in pastoral administration, will have been accurately gauged by the pontifical authorities, and that in the appointment of bishops the Holy See is apt to follow the practical test of efficiency rather than the precedent of elections subject to favor or accident.

THE HISTORY OF EPITAPHS.

THE value of monumental records and tombstone inscriptions is not sufficiently recognized by the general public of this generation; and yet what archives they are! Year by year, century after century, they silently but effectively preserve and proclaim "the short and simple annals of the poor," rescue from oblivion stray pages of local history, or recount and immortalize the deeds of many a "hero of the valley":

> Some village Hampden, that with dauntless breast,
> The little tyrant of his fields withstood;
> Some mute inglorious Milton here may rest,
> Some Cromwell guiltless of his country's blood.

There is yet a further reason why epitaphs have a claim on our study and reverence. It has been said that man is the creature of circumstance; but who dare deny the other half of the truth, namely, that man is the creature of fashion? This siren not only dominates, but practically permeates our whole sublunary existence. Fashion prescribes our attire, regulates our diet, orders our recreations; fashion guides our artistic tastes and moulds our opinions; fashion tyrannizes over our domestic exchequer. In these days of publicity and public duties, fashion invades our closet and controls even our hours of repose and privacy. And it must be admitted that, now, fashion is beginning even to influence our morals. Mrs. Grundy does indeed loom big on the horizon of every-man's individuality, and powerful forsooth is her sway: hardly any one dares withstand her.

Hence it is no surprise to find, not only a history, but also

fashions, in the matter of epitaphs and burials, according to the period, nationality, or rank of the deceased. "In the most remote epoch of the world's history we find that the dead were treated with respect, not to say worshipped; for a natural sentiment leads savage as well as civilized man to pay the last tribute of affection to the bodies of those for whom he once felt affection, esteem, or fear. Such is the moral principle of the various modes of burial which have been successively practised, viz., embalmment, incineration, interment." No work of art is more curious, or fuller of historical information, than the funeral monuments of all ages. But it must be that there is a marked distinction between the coffin and the tomb, one being the receptacle of the dead, the other only a monument raised to mark the spot in which the coffin has been interred. Let us cursorily consider a few words, connected with inscriptions and monumental erections to the dead, which are now in general use.

Sepulchre is perhaps the most ancient and best. At first it meant merely a grave, but later it signified an ornamental tomb, a monument. *Sepulcra* has been somewhat fancifully read "semi-pulchra" (half-fair, or beautiful), in allusion to the outer part of the tomb, which is ornamented, whilst the interior, containing only the mortal remains, is shrouded in darkness or obscurity.

Monument literally means a memorial. It does not necessarily imply a grave. Xenophon says they were erected only for soldiers whose bodies could not easily be found. And a *cenotaph* means an empty tomb: a monumental erection to one whose remains are not contained within.

Bust (Latin: *bustum*) is, more properly, confined to the Romans, in their practice of cremating their dead. The term is strictly applied to the burial of a body in the same place in which it had been burnt. And from this it came to be used as signifying a tomb.

Mausoleum generally means a sumptuous and gigantic tomb. Its derivation has been attributed to the conduct of Artemisia, the wife and sister of Mausolus. So intense was

her grief at his death, that she drank in her liquor the ashes of his body, and erected so grand a monument that it was esteemed one of the Seven Wonders of the World. The monument received the name of "Mausoleum" and this term has ever since been applied to all similar erections of extraordinary extent or splendor.

The mound and the pyramid constitute the earliest monuments; then followed the erection of pillars, and subsequently the recording of inscriptions. The Egyptians may lay claim to be the earliest recorders of this description, by the writing of their names, their descent, and their functions, upon their sarcophagi and coffins.

Sepulchral monuments of different countries are, then, not to be lightly esteemed. They largely help to constitute the materials for the history of the arts. The epitaphs of Great Britain, in particular, mark the diversity of sentiment and literary taste prevailing at different periods of its history. Although they will be found often not to admit of any severe grammatical criticism, it is to the sentiment which they are intended to convey that our attention should be carefully directed. Camden traces the origin of epitaphs to the scholars of Linus, the Theban poet, who, he says, first bewailed their master, when he was slain, in doleful verse, called of him *Ælinum* and afterwards *Epitaphia*, for they were first sung at burials, and afterwards engraved upon the sepulchres. They were also called *Eulogia* and *Tituli* by the Romans; but by the early English by a mere English compound-word signifying a burial-song. This burial-song was frequently extended to too great a length; hence Plato—as quoted by Cicero in *De Legibus*—made a law that an epitaph should be comprised in four verses.

But whatever may have been the origin of epitaphs, it must be admitted that there is much justice in the remark of Dr. Johnson, that "nature and reason have dictated to every nation that to preserve good actions from oblivion is both the interest and duty of mankind; and therefore we find no people acquainted with the use of letters that omitted to grace the

tombs of their heroes and wise men with panegyrical inscriptions." And, in one of the conversations recorded by Boswell, the great moralist is reported to have said that the writer of an epitaph should not be considered as saying nothing but what is strictly true; allowance must be made for some degree of exaggerated praise—"In lapidary inscriptions a man is not upon his oath."

The object in the erection of monuments and inscriptions is twofold: first, to record the identity and character of the deceased; secondly, to remind us of mortality. The Egyptians—the earliest people of whom we have truly satisfactory records—attained this not only by the erection of their extraordinary tombs and temples, but also by the preservation of the bodies of their ancestors, and the retention of them for a time even in their own homes.

Greek sepulchral monuments are not so numerous as Roman, but the Grecian epitaphs are characterized by a peculiar beauty and fertility of expression. The Greeks wrote their epitaphs in elegaic verse, and afterwards in prose. They were very commonly epigrammatic.

The following, inscribed on two neighboring tombs, is attributed to Plato:

> This is a sailor's—that a ploughman's tomb—
> Thus sea and land abide one common doom.

There is much feeling in the following:

> Drop o'er Antibia's grave a pious tear;
> For virtue, beauty, wit, lie buried here.
> Full many a suitor sought her father's hall,
> To gain the virgin's love: but Death, o'er all,
> Claimed due precedence: who shall Death withstand?
> Their hopes were blasted by his ruthless hand.

From another source we take the following:

> Grieve not, Philœnis, though condemned to die
> Far from thy parent soil and native sky;
> Though strangers' hands must raise thy funeral pile,
> And lay thy ashes in a foreign isle:
> To all on Death's last dreary journey bound,
> The road is equal, and alike the ground.

The epigrammatic style of many of the Grecian epitaphs is well illustrated in that ascribed to Anacreon, on the tomb of Timocritus:

> Timocritus adorns this humble grave;
> Mars spares the coward, and destroys the brave.

The Greeks appeared to have not considered the insertion of the deceased's name as essential to an inscription. But it was common—and, indeed, esteemed a duty—among them, to inscribe epitaphs to those who had distinguished themselves in war and fallen in battle. There are several instances of this to those who fell at Thermopylæ.

The Romans erected their monuments by the highway, that they might become constant objects of attention. These, however, offered scarcely anything beyond the inscription of the name, and perhaps the consulate under which the individual lived. It was the position of the monuments by the roadside that gave rise to the address so commonly found upon them, as "Siste Viator," "Aspice Viator," "Cave Viator," etc.

The Romans held the number *XVII* as unlucky, and esteemed it the number of death. By writing the number seventeen thus: VIXI (i. e., VI + XI = *XVII*) the Latin word *vixi* is formed, which implies, "I have ceased to live." But the most frequent expressions on the Roman tombs, both of Pagan and Christian times, was a passage from Tacitus: *Sit tibi terra levis*, i. e. Light lie the earth upon thee. And it has been thought that this favorite wish of the ancients—namely, the idea of the earth lying lightly on the body of the person interred—may have suggested the plan, subsequently followed, of raising cells of heaped stones or sods within the vast barrows (or *tumuli*) afterwards heaped over them. It was reserved for the introduction of Christianity to extend epitaphs by holding out to the living the doctrine of the resurrection of the body. The catacombs of Rome offer some very interesting information on this subject.

There is one remarkable Roman inscription belonging to

the fifth century, to the wife of a priest, which bears testimony to a belief in the Christian doctrine of the resurrection. A translation of it runs thus: "Pretonia, a priest's wife, the type of modesty, in this place I lay my bones: spare your tears, dear husband and daughters, and believe that it is forbidden to weep for one who lives in God. Buried in peace, on the third Nones of October, in the Consulate of Festus" (i. e. 472 A. D.).

Epitaphs of the Romano-British period were, like those of the Romans, very simple, there being little beyond the name and offices of the deceased, or with the addition of an invocation to the "Manes" (infernal deities) of the deceased, together with an occasional mention of the name of the person who erected or inscribed the monument.

The epitaphs belonging to the Saxon period in England consist of little more than simple inscriptions; and the instances recorded of them are few in number. Early in the nineteenth century some were discovered at Hartlepool. They date back to, probably, the end of the seventh century. A noble Northumbrian lady named Heiu—the first to make profession of the Christian faith in that kingdom—established (within fifty years after the advent of St. Augustine to England, and about the time St. Aidan became the first bishop of Lindisfarne) a convent at Hartlepool, of which she became the first abbess, continuing that office until about 649 A. D., when she removed to Tadcaster. In her place she left St. Hilda (the daughter of Hereric, the nephew of King Eaduini), a lady of singular piety and administrative talent. The convent was exposed to the fury of the Danes in the ninth century, and from that time it ceased to be.

It is therefore not very surprising that all records in regard to it should have been lost; and it was not until 1833, while making excavations in a field called "Cross Close", that the remains of a cemetery were discovered. At a depth of not three and one half feet from the surface, on a limestone rock, several skeletons (all apparently of females) were observed placed in two rows, lying north and south, with the

heads placed upon flat stones as pillows, with larger stones above them, marked with crosses and inscriptions in Saxon and runic characters. A few of these escaped annihilation. Number one was a Saxon tombstone, having a cross incised, with alpha and omega in the divisions formed by the upper branch of the cross, whilst in those beneath was engraved, in runic letters, the female name Hildithryth. Number two presented a somewhat similar appearance to number one, with another female name Hilddigyth, also in runic characters. Number three has a similar cross to number two; but the inscription is in Saxon lettering, and reads Edilvini. Number four is of like character to number three, but is a tombstone for two persons, whose names are preceded by a solicitation for the prayers of the faithful: "Ora pro Vermond" being in one division, and "Torhtsvid" in the other. Number five is still more remarkable, for there are two inscriptions petitioning prayers for those mentioned in numbers three and four: "Orate pro Edilvini"; "Orate pro Vermond et Torhtsvid." In this instance the cross varies in form, and is in relief. The place where the above five interesting remains were discovered was the field called the Cross Close in Hartlepool, and may perhaps be regarded as connected with these monuments.

Five years later (in 1838) further excavations were made, and other interesting relics obtained, among which number six was unearthed. It was an incised cross, with the alpha and omega, and the name Berchtgyd in Saxon letters. Another five years elapsed, and (in 1843) two more Saxon tombstones were discovered. Number seven was a Saxon tombstone bearing an engraved cross, and the inscription "Hanegnevd"; which is also probably a name, but if so, the form is singular. Number eight was a cross of elegant form and design. All that remained of the inscription was "Vgvid." With the discovery of these tombstones, skeletons were found, and various antiquities denoting the time to which the above inscriptions belonged. The names on these Saxon gravestones are—with the exception of Vermond and Edilvini—

those of females; and the works of Venerable Bede mention names similar to those inscribed on these monumental stones: Bregusuid was the mother of St. Hilda, and Hersuid was St. Hilda's sister. Hildilid was Abbess of Barking, Eadgyd and Torchtgyd were nuns in the same monastery. And Frigyd was Abbess of Hackness.

The Saxons were, at a late period, in the habit of erecting richly sculptured crosses in places devoted to burial, and number eight is a worthy example of the combination of extreme simplicity and rich elegance in design. It is very significant, too, that the characters used on the above stones bear a striking similarity to those employed in the Irish MSS. of the sixth and seventh centuries, in the well-known Gospels of St. Columb and St. Ceadda, and the Books of Kells and Armagh. Furthermore, similarly formed crosses to those on the Hartlepool stones may be seen in the ancient Irish monasteries.

So far as England is concerned, epitaphs do not appear to have been in general use until after the eleventh century. The few that have been found that are of earlier date are in Latin. Specimens of a few are to be found in the pages of St. Bede, Ordericus Vitalis, and other early writers. The instances quoted are epitaphs chiefly on royal personages or celebrated ecclesiastical dignitaries. By a study of the epitaphial writings still preserved in England we find that in Early English times inscriptions were prohibited to be engraved on any tombs but those belonging to persons distinguished by their position or remarkable for their wisdom or virtues. "In this respect the English seem to have copied the Lacedemonians, who allowed the honor of epitaphs only to those men who died bravely in battle, and to those women who were distinguished by their chastity. Hence arose the veneration with which those monuments were viewed, and the solicitude entertained to protect them from injury. They were esteemed sacred, and any violence offered to them was punishable by banishment, condemnation to the mines, or even the loss of members of the body, according to the extent and nature of the offence, regard being also paid to the rank of the deceased to whom the tomb appertained."

We have, from a manuscript of St. Augustine, perhaps one of the most ancient epitaphs belonging to England. It is that of King Kenelme, the son of Kenelphus, who was said to have been murdered at the instigation of his sister Quendreda, sometimes called Heskebert, and hidden in a wood in Staffordshire.

Leonine verses prevailed in the monumental inscriptions of England during the twelfth century. A good example is that of Gundrada (the fifth daughter of William the Conqueror, and the wife of William, Earl of Warrenne) at Lewes, in Sussex. In 1845, the tomb and remains were examined, the leaden coffins of the earl and his wife—who were the founders of Lewes Priory—having been discovered in making a cutting for the Hastings and Brighton Railway, through the spot once so famous for its Cluniac Monastery, founded soon after the Norman conquest. There can be no doubt as to who were the occupants, for their names were inscribed:

> Gundred, illustrious branch of ducal race,
> Brought into England's Church balsamic grace;
> Pious as Mary, and as Martha kind,
> To generous deeds she gave her virtuous mind.
> Though the cold tomb her Martha's part receives,
> Her Mary's better part for ever lives.
> O holy Pancras! keep with gracious care
> A mother who has made thy sons her heir.
> On the Sixth Calend of June's fatal morn
> The marble frame, by inward struggles torn,
> Freed the pure soul, which upwards bent its way
> To realms of love, and scenes of endless day.

French epitaphs were common in England until the middle of the fourteenth century, and continued in use even into the fifteenth century. The specimen in Canterbury Cathedral, on Edward, the Black Prince (who died in 1376), affords an excellent example. An earlier instance of the fourteenth century is found at Lewes, on John Warren, the seventh earl of Surrey, who died in 1304. The king ordered prayers for his soul to be said throughout the Province of Canterbury, and a forty days' indulgence was given by the Archbishop of Canterbury, and several of the bishops, to all who should pray

for his soul. An early fifteenth-century example is to be found in the choir of Lincoln Cathedral, on Catherine Swinford, the wife of John of Gaunt. An early epitaph, written in old English, is found at Thornhill, Yorkshire, to a member of the Saville family. It may belong to the early part of the fourteenth century. And at Wanlip, Leicestershire, to the memory of Sir Thomas Walsh and lady, there is a brass belonging to the close of the same century, dated 1393. In Salle church, Norfolk, on a brass (dated 1454) is represented an emaciated figure in a sheet. This is given in Cotman's *Monumental Brasses*, and is probably the earliest representation known of a skeleton on a brass, in England.

In St. Antholin's there is an inscription to a Doctor Lempster, who died at the very opening of the Tudor period. It is dated 1487, and has peculiar interest in affording evidence of the prevalence of images in English churches at that time:

> Under this marbl ston, lyth the body of Master Walter Lempster, doctor of phisick, and also phisition to the high and mighty prynce Hen. VII, whych Master Lempster gayve unto thys chyrch too cheynes of fyne gold, weying xiiii ounces and a quarter, for to make a certeyn ornament, to put on the blessyd body of our Saviour Jesu. He died the ix of March, M.cccclxxxvij. Whos sowl God pardon.

Even previous to the Puritan times, and following immediately upon the suppression of the monasteries, the desolation produced by the wanton destruction of splendid tombs during the reigns of Henry VIII and Edward VI was very great, and continued even during the early part of Elizabeth's reign. In fact, to such an extent was the spoliation carried that, in the second year of her reign, Queen Elizabeth issued a "Proclamation against breaking or defacing of Monuments of antiquitie being set up in Churches or other Public Places for Memory and not for Superstition"; and another, in the fourteenth year of her reign, charging the Justices of her Assize "to provide some remedy both for the punishment of offenders and the reformation of such practices."

JOHN R. FRYAR.

St. Edmund's, Canterbury, England.

THE PRIEST AS TEACHER OF HIS FLOCK.

ALTHOUGH the Gospel differs from all philosophical systems by its procedure and methods, yet it admirably harmonizes with every law of mind and matter, and will bear the most searching analysis, in this respect, in every detail of its teaching.

It was addressed to the whole people, not to a school or a coterie, and it assumes the truth of the great intuitions on which the whole great work of life is based; it does not argue about the soul or its properties, about the definition of life, or the ultimate reason of joy or sorrow; it postulates the being of God, His relations with the world, His eternal love for man, it speaks of sin and justice, as if the full nature of these subtle things was a commonplace of the popular mind, and then proceeds to build upon these immovable foundations the whole economy of Redemption.

No doubt this method had special suitability for the society to which the Christian doctrine was principally addressed; the Hebrew mind, even amid the distractions of the Messianic period, was saturated with the words and thoughts of the old Testament, and this secured a substantial identity between popular thought and revealed truth, so that there was no need of arguing on the points absolutely woven into the national mind.

But when the time came to convey the great message to peoples whose intuitions had been misled, and whose ideals were a world away from the right conception of primary things, then began not only the preaching of the Gospel, but its criticism, its exegesis, its defence, and from this terrible crucible its golden wisdom came forth in all its lustre. It was not enough for St. Paul's work that he should announce the Messiah; this did very well in the synagogues of Damascus or Antioch; there he was understood by everyone, and his thoughts, however opposed, were at least thoroughly apprehended. But when he was face to face with Grecian civilization, where the unseen was as a dream, and the heart confessed itself captive to the beauty of the world and its pal-

pable satisfactions, and never even imagined the sublime liberty of the sons of God, then his work became apology, his ministry was to show the higher wisdom the Church teaches, and to apply it to every need of practical life.[1]

The work of the ministry in our own time is carried on under circumstances substantially like those that met the Apostolic teachers when they found themselves face to face with the Gentile peoples. No doubt there are degrees in the opposition offered to the Gospel among different peoples and even among different sections of the same race and country.

No one would say that the same methods would produce like results in secluded country parishes, where the movement of speculative thought is scarcely felt, and in a university town, where the air is filled with noise of controversy, and the work of life is principally the asking of questions and the satisfying of doubts.

Again, when a national mind has been for centuries under the influence of heresy, as in England and Germany, or of atheism, as in Latin countries, when books and press-work of every kind carry the habit of negation into every section of the national life, the work of the priest must meet the broader needs of the people, by assuring them a teaching such as will undo the evil influences at work in their midst, and vindicate the whole body of Catholic truth.[2]

[1] This is evident from innumerable passages in the Epistles where he exhaustively deals with subjects which the Gospel narrative merely teaches in the most summary way. The Baptist, for his hearers, sufficiently announced the scope of the mission of the Messiah by the words: "Ecce Agnus Dei, ecce qui tollit peccatum mundi;" but Saint Paul had to develop for *his* audience the entire question of original sin, its origin and consequences; else his preaching would have been a matter of mere words. In the same way he treats of charity, of the Resurrection, of the grace of the priesthood—all of which great themes are simply *stated* by the Evangelists, whereas they are *argued* and expounded by him.

[2] The spirit of opposition to Christian teaching is of all time and has been the motive of systematic defense of doctrine from the beginning. The Catechism of the Council of Trent expressly states this fact as the reason of its legislation on this head: "At vero quum haec divini verbi praedicatio nunquam intermitti in ecclesia debeat tum certe hoc tempore majori studio et pietate elaborandum est, ut sana et incorrupta doctrina tanquam pabulo vitae fideles nutriantur et confirmentur." *Praefatio*, No. 5.

The localities which preserve intact their simplicity and unquestioning loyalty to Catholic ideals, become fewer and rarer every day; and the process by which they fall into line with the spirit of the greater world is not difficult to trace. The facility of communication between the centers of population and the remote districts brings the two extremes into daily touch. The wider fields that are now open to work and talent fascinate young people who are conscious of their capacity and consequently ambitious, and who are easily overcome by the subtle charm of a new world where thought is unchained and the chances of an intenser life are so likely to be realized. These come and go for a while and their presence is a reason why others should feel the unrest of home, and the desire to end it. With these gradually enter new points of view, a more refined speech, and they fatally bring with them also the shadows of their new surroundings; the crude theories, the easy morality, the impatience of control, which invariably mark city life, pass into the veins of their home-circle and create new needs and new perils which must be met and satisfied by those who assume the direction of the popular conscience.

The formal way for a pastor of souls to meet these growing needs of his people is found in the full and continuous preaching of the Gospel truths. These have within them the divine force by which they conquer and subdue every species of error. In the mouth of St. Paul they broke the power of Grecian civilization, and, in the hands of Jerome and Chrysostom and Augustine, they trampled over all the powers of the Roman Empire, and planted in the world's inmost heart the seed of new institutions and the promise of higher ideals. This divine efficacy still remains in the work of the Christian ministry and it must be evolved by the spirit of charity,[3] which

[3] This spirit of charity which should mark the action of the pastor and teacher toward his flock is admirably described by St. Augustine: "Et quia cum eadem omnibus debeatur charitas non eadem est omnibus adhibendi medicina; alios curat aedificare, alios contremescit offendere; ad alios se inclinat, ad alios se erigit; aliis blanda; aliis severa, nulli inimica, omnibus mater. *De Catechizandis Rudibus*, Cap. XV.

alone makes a priest ardent in his search for souls and potent in the discharge of his apostolic work. The teaching Church, while it formally resides in the Holy See and the Episcopate, yet effectively communicates its wisdom by the various channels through which revealed truth reaches individual souls. These are as many as there are individuals who directly or indirectly coöperate in the instruction of the faithful: parents, in the family circle, exercise a teaching function which cannot be overestimated; writers of books which deal with doctrinal and moral questions from a Catholic point of view, largely enter into the educational work of the Church; but the pastor of souls who, within the limits of his jurisdiction, undertakes as *the work of his life* the function of teaching his people the whole cycle of Christian Doctrine, he in a special way is associated with the Apostolic College whose primary charter was "Euntes, docete!"

Consequently, while there is only one sovereign teacher in the visible Church, and a relatively small number who, as bishops, watch over the integrity of doctrine and secure the supreme interests of the Faith by keeping vigilant eyes on religious teaching in their dioceses, there is in every parish an authorized School, where a consecrated minister deals directly with the people, instructing, warning, guiding individual souls,[4] and concentrating upon their destinies all the lights and all the comforts of the teaching of Christ. He does not deal with propositions of abstract morality, with the metaphysical formulas of the Schools; his concern is with living men and women, whom he forms to the ideals of Christian life by the continuous systematic teaching of the Gospel truths. He knows the needs of his people; he follows their doubts and is conscious of their dangers; he fully grasps the forces which form their atmosphere and affect their temperament; and, when he speaks to them, his words are winged with the sympathy that comes from his fellowship as a man, as well as from his zeal as a pastor and guide.

[4] "Et pro capacitate ac viribus audientis proque ipsius temporis modulo." *De Catechizandis Rudibus.* Cap. VII.

This parish school of which he is the head, is the most striking institution created by the outward polity of the Church, and has no counterpart in any religion whose origin was not divine. In the pagan world the teacher was the poet, or the law-giver, or orator; the priest stood silent by the altar, and when his sacrifice was done, his work was accomplished.

There is not a word left us by the priesthood of the heathen world; their rites sprang from the intimate needs of society for a communication with the unseen, and they were interpreted by the common sense of the whole people whose service was accomplished by the sacerdotal caste.

Our religious life comes from without, and is fixed in its meanings by its Divine Author, who interprets His own law, by His own servants, whose word is clothed with the power of Him whom they serve. The priest, when he turns toward his people, sees them in the revealing light of the Divine Word; he pierces every relation of their being, and weighs their responsibilities to the finest point; he perceives them as they are in respect of God, their Creator, and of man, their fellow-creature; he fixes the duties of sacrifice, penance, and prayer, of truth and justice, of dependence and liberty; he scans the whole horizon of duty and sums up the full meaning of life.[5] And this mighty work has become one of the commonplaces of Christian experience, and, at times, to those even who are called to this supreme ministry, its exercise passes into the fatal region of routine, so perfectly has the parish school become identified with the daily commonplace of our modern world; and yet there are those who deny the intellectual activity of the Church, and pretend that she has no message for the nations!

To meet the needs of a society that thinks, and reasons, and

[5] This faculty of justly estimating the needs of his hearers is a consequence of the *Gratia Status* and comes as the fruit of constant prayer. St. Augustine beautifully notes this point: "Et haec se posse, si potuerit, et in quantum potuerit, pietate magis orationum quam oratorum facultate non dubitet; ut orando pro se et illis quos est allocuturus sit orator antequam dictor." *De Doctrina Christiana*, Lib. 4, Cap. XV.

doubts, it is not enough to announce the great truths of Revelation; the preacher who reaches the height of his sublime ministry must develop the motives of Faith, and put the arguments in its behalf, clothed with all the evidence of their truth, before the minds of his auditory. What a splendid field this opens for the sacred orator! No finer intellectual task can fall to any teacher than this work of Christian apology, in which a man, specially formed by long years of conscientious study for this intellectual defence of revealed Truth, undertakes to strengthen the grip of believing souls upon the sublime heritage of their Faith. If it is a privilege given to few to explain to a select group of professional inquirers the contents of Catholic dogma in the quiet academic reserves of a seminary or university, how much higher the vocation that calls a man to confront the living issues of real life, opposing the invincible force of supernatural truth to the fallacy and bad faith of the modern world, whose disloyal abuse of the larger culture of our times could wrench from simple souls that unquestioning trust in the message of the Church, which assures to all the people that unconscious subtlety which perceives the absolute reasonableness of super-reasonable truth, and that intuitive obedience to ethical principles whose ultimate reason may be beyond the personal analysis of those who are most blessed by their concrete application! When a priest has given these simple souls the satisfaction of hearing their creed justified and sustained by scientific treatment, I think he has touched the most intimate intellectual happiness that can come to anyone whose life-work lies in the world of thought. To such a one it will not be enough to announce from the pulpit that God exists, that He is one, eternal, immense, the absolute True, and the absolute Good; he will prove, demonstrate these supreme facts, and make his people know and feel the impregnable rock on which the Catholic creed triumphantly rests. He will open the treasury of the Schools and bring into view its inexhaustible riches. With what rapture young men will follow their pastor, as he develops with living eloquence the various arguments by which theology defends the attributes

of the Godhead.[6] Under his sympathetic touch, what new energy will come to the dead formulas of the Schools! The peasants who live in daily nearness to the marvels of nature, will exult when they know that the course of the seasons, the beauty of the flowers, the marvellous structure of the animal kingdom, all enter into the scheme of Christian defense, and lend their eloquent voices to a hymn of praise to their Creator. The more subtle arguments that arise from the analysis of our nature will turn our eyes upon the mysterious text of our intellectual being, and awaken a consciousness of the marvels of that inner world of which so few of the uneducated seem even to think. The argument of conscience and its functions, freed from its Kantian aspects, of which we hear so much nowadays, will create a sense of responsibility which cannot but subserve the purposes of careful living, and will induce a clearer view of our inter-relations with the Deity who now, as in the beginning, *multifariam multisque modis* communicates to us the manifestations of Himself. If this first lesson of the parish schools were always treated with the fullness and sufficiency to which it lends itself so easily, there would be a deepening of religious sense, a broadening of the basis of belief, which would issue in a higher appreciation of the Majesty of the Creator, and the consequent growth in the practices by which He is served and loved.

When the preacher treats of the mystery of the Incarnation,[7] he will find matter for months of careful study, and will have scored a triumph if he brings home to his people even a part of its mysterious truth. If he humbly follows the Angelic

[6] This, the first article of the Creed, is magnificently developed in the Catechism of the Council of Trent, which the pastor should follow not only in the order of his preaching but also in its arguments. These proceed with unrivalled cogency and force.

[7] "Mirificam et uberrimam esse utilitatem quae ex hujus articuli fine et confessione confluxit ad humanum genus et illud Sancti Joannis testimonium ostendit: Quisquis confessus fuerit, quoniam Jesus est filius Dei, Deus in eo manet et ipse in Deo."

Hoc enim fundamentum firmissimum est nostrae salutis et redemptionis. *Catechismus Romanus*, Art 2, 1.

Doctor, and breaks the bread of his teaching to the needs of the popular intelligence, he will have a wealth of material that will shine through his pastoral eloquence. There will not be a careless listener if he knows how to treat of the great argument of the Redemption; its antecedent reasons, the suitability of its epoch, the methods of its accomplishment. These themes will fascinate his hearers. One can fancy the effect of a clear analysis of the being of the God-Man adequately put before a Catholic audience; they will learn to fix an exact meaning to words like "personality," "nature," "liberty," "will," and such like, of which, though they enter necessarily into every catechism, so few of our people have any clear ideas. And when he passes from dogmatic questions to the recital of the deeds that accompanied the "Life of our Life," he can make a picture that has energy to move the coldest heart. The gentleness of the Omnipotent made man, the humility of the Most High: "ἡ χρηστότης καὶ ἡ φιλανθρωπία τοῦ σωτῆρος ἡμων θεοῦ; these truths give an unparalleled opportunity for moving hearts toward a further imitation of Him who is always the Way, and the Truth.

Then if we examine the doctrine of the Gospels and find the sacramental system, the duty and model of prayer, the basis of ecclesiastical government, the germ of every devotion and practice that has since blown into fullest flower, what a comfort for souls that sorrow, what a strength for doubting hearts, what a triumphant apology for that Church on whose firm truth we can rest with new confidence, and further peace! Grouped with the mystery of the Incarnation we find the most sacred personalities of Catholic devotion. The name of Mary comes at once to the lips of whosoever will preach the Christ. It is the duty of the Catholic pulpit to fully treat of her rôle in the work of Redemption, of her prerogatives, of her joys, and of her sorrows. The Mother of God does not always find worthy treatment at the hands of those who speak her praise. She has need of being known as God made her, and her mission can only be interpreted through the medium of strict revelations. No vague phrases of exaggerated devotion can

be justly linked with her name; she has absolutely fixed rights, and these must be duly rendered to her blessed name. A sacred orator must endeavor to appreciate clearly and fully her place in the economy of the Gospels; her immunity from original sin and its consequences must be proved and examined; the difficulties that arise from various texts and various facts in Church history must be noted and satisfactorily met, and her full place in Catholic thought amply vindicated. All this can be done in the light of careful, scientific study; every commentary of the schools deals with these questions, and no preacher undertakes the work of Marian theology as a matter of individual enterprise or original inquiry. The work has been well done by competent hands, and he who seeks a master in such studies will easily find one.[8]

I should like to insist upon this point: in our day it is well to be accurate, owing to the hypercritical spirit that is abroad; but even for intrinsic reasons we should honorably walk within the limits of truth, and if we go one millimeter outside to find the object of our praise, our homage is no longer given to a sacred and venerable personality, but to the outcome of our own ignorant phantasy.

The other great names that meet us in the Scripture records will give occasion for the most efficacious pastoral teaching. The names of Peter and John and Paul are not mere incidents in the general narrative; they are concrete evidences of the word of Christ, and in their personal history and moral growth are splendid themes for popular instruction. The humble beginnings of the Prince of the Apostles, the various incidents of his call, the touching facts of his personal relations with our Saviour; his ardent love, his impetuous temperament, the sudden reactions that swung him from the extreme of heroic resolve to the furthest conceivable limit of cowardice, his fall, his repentance, his elevation, his power in the new Church, his superb eloquence when preaching the Crucified on the traitorous streets of Jerusalem—all this gives us mat-

[8] Among recent works of this kind I would recommend one by the Rev. A. Lépicier, of the Order of Servites.

ter for the finest oratorical movement, and its light and shadow will fascinate the hearers who feel within themselves the germs of all the contradictions and the hope of realizing many of these wonderful facts.

With Peter's name is associated the Primacy, that first resided in him, and has since descended in unbroken line to his successors in the See of Rome, and this great fundamental argument might perhaps be best treated in association with the narrative or panegyric of his life.

If the Primacy was given to one whose nature was *a priori* unfitted for such a trust, if it was supremely exercised by him in spite of the narrowness of his culture, and the evident weakness of his impetuous temperament, assuredly it will follow that the essential fitness of his successors in the mighty charge laid upon them, must not be measured by their natural gifts, or even by their personal virtues, but rather from the objective fact of their concrete office, in which they are sustained by the hand of Him who could keep Peter above the waves in which the weight of his unhelped humanity would have inevitably buried him!

In citing the names of John and Paul, I am urged by the present fact of the interest they have for contemporary theological thought. They are the centers of a movement whose success would be the death-knell of Catholic tradition, and in the parish school we must be brave and loyal, and meet the enemy of the hour. St. John's life is the idyll of the Gospel story: his gentleness, his bravery, his love for the Master, his glorious stand by the Cross, his tender mission toward the Mater Dolorosa—who can read of all this without emotion, and who can speak of it without casting fire between his words and kindling analogous feelings among his hearers? And fancy that this privileged being was in the sequel called to martyrdom and exile, and that in his oldest age he was forced to defend in the Church the truths he had in his youth touched with his hands and seen with his loving eyes! What a lesson for the countless Christian souls who seem to live ever under the Old Testament, and look for the rewards of a righteous

life in the joys and consolations that it should bring to them even here below, in their short passage between life and death!

But St. John was not only a virgin soul, bound by special charity to the Redeemer, he was also the greatest of the Evangelists, and revealed to the Church more of the divine mystery of the Man-God's life than can be found in any other source of Christian knowledge. So true is this, that the enemies of the Gospel have from the beginning labored to undermine his authority and decry his witness, and even in our own day some have risen within the very Church of Christ, who dare to question his right to the authorship of the Fourth Gospel, and would fain reduce the traditions linked with his name to the proportions of an empty myth or a clumsy fable. In my opinion, if a pastor should have reason to believe that such opinions gained ground among his people, he is strictly bound by priestly honor and by the terms even of his implicit contract with the teaching Church, to master the technical question at issue and boldly undertake the defense of Catholic doctrine. This work is not for everyone; but everyone is not a pastor of souls who has been adjudged mentally and morally fitted for this precise duty, and the priest who has willingly and joyfully entered upon the career of ruling, guiding, and instructing a parish, and who will not take up the necessary study needed in our times for the full discharge of those intellectual duties, is unworthy of his dignity, and should, in honor, give way to another whose culture and zeal will enable him to meet the needs of a most serious situation.

The obligation of defending and explaining the ministry of St. Paul becomes evident in view of recent criticism in contemporary theology. His personal history and development have made him one of the most dramatic figures in the world's gallery of great men; these will recommend themselves to any preacher, and will give ample material for the lights and shadows that enter so necessarily into artistic rhetoric. It is well, however, for the pastor to bind the Pauline teaching with the Gospel facts; to demonstrate that the Holy Spirit chose the temperament of a man of marvelous natural

gifts, for the more intense treatment of revealed truth; to analyze for a questioning and philosophic people the synthesis that sufficed for the Hebrew mind, and so bring into view all the subtle consequences of the Incarnation and all the sublime prerogatives of the God who "emptied Himself" in order to fill us with the riches of His redeeming grace. A pastor who does this work conscientiously and fully, will do more for his people than if he had built a dozen hospitals and established a series of Catholic clubs; he will have ministered to the "mind diseased of our crazy times," and accomplished a work of the most signal and intimate charity.

When the pastor narrows his teaching to the particular dogmas and practices of the Church, he will find the same wide field for intense study and, perhaps, an even more urgent obligation to give his people full and thoroughly reasoned instructions.[9]

If he takes up the Sacraments as his theme, he touches what is most vital in the Christian economy, and reaches furthest into the individual needs of his flock. If he searches, he can easily find abundant matter on this subject, and its competent development will answer unvoiced doubts of many a faithful soul with regard to the mysterious methods established by Christ for the diffusion of grace within His Church. There is no more fascinating section of theology than that which examines the general sacramental theory; the Schools are at their best while they demonstrate the fitness of the external rites for minds placed, like ours, even in regard to their intellectual functions, under the dominion of the senses; so that one finds in the material rite a subtle significance that helps to realize the true inwardness of a ceremony, at once a symbol and an efficacious spiritual agency. I do not pretend to say

[9] The Roman Catechism treats with especial fullness of the Sacraments, and gives to the sacred orator a series of points for popular instruction which practically exhaust the subject. It marks the particular obligation by which the pastor is bound to instruct his people on this cardinal subject: "Parochi *facultatem* et *industriam postulat singularem* ut ejus accurata ac frequenti perceptione fideles tales evadant quibus praestantissmae res digne et salutariter impertiri possint." Pars 2, Cap. I.

that one should always put before the people all the theories that go to sustain rival systems concerning the modality of sacramental efficacy, but there are times and occasions when a firm and clear exposition even of such questions might perhaps have a certain very real usefulness.

For the special treatment of the Sacraments, a thorough apology for each, on the traditional lines, will be a pastor's duty; he will prove their truth from Scripture and tradition, and for the development of the latter he will find in the Fathers and sacred writers all the sources of instruction the people need so as to profit by these sacred fountains of spiritual life and moral strength. I venture, even here, to hold that the fullest examination of the whole question at issue is in the long run the best and safest.[10] The outward growth and ritual evolution of the Sacraments is a fact that everyone may know; the relatively greater rôle of Baptism in the primitive Church, and the, at times, disconcerting silence of orthodox writers on the question of sacramental Penance, do not dislocate one jot of the complex evidence for the Divine institution of the power to remit sins; the exterior cultus of the Blessed Sacrament was *bound to grow* with the progress of Christian society, when there is no further reason for the discipline of the secret; a living society in which resides the power to legislate *must modify usage* in order to coördinate religion to new needs; and so on, every accidental change can be justified, its wisdom demonstrated, and the essential unity of Christian teaching in every age amply vindicated. This sort of work must be undertaken, I repeat, in view of special conditions; but these conditions tend to spread themselves.

Any pastor may find himself any day in their presence, and he should be ready to meet them not with the blunted weapons

[10] *Cf.* Saint Augustine *de Catechizandis Rudibus*, Cap. VI: "Ita ut singularum rerum atque gestorum quae narramus causae rationesque reddantur quibus ea referamus ad illum finem dilectionis unde neque agentis aliquid neque loquentis oculus avertendus est." These beautiful words fix the limits of the more intense preaching we venture to recommend as useful and necessary for our time. He may never pass beyond the limits of that true charity due to the supreme interests of souls.

of a baseless dogmatism but with the fine sense of historic perspective that puts things in their right shading, and consequently in the true light which shows them as they really are, in the series of historic facts.

In this connexion it may be well to insist upon an essential point, which is not always kept in view by those who follow in practice the method here advocated. The Catholic apologist should show himself to be *a priori* convinced of the truth of the Catholic position, impregnated with the spirit of the Church, and urged by his loyalty to her in the work he has assumed. It is fatal to Catholic defence when its defenders seem to sympathize with what they oppose; when they multiply the arguments of our enemies, and have no just regard for the Faith of their hearers, who, for the most part, have not the culture required to meet, alone, the terrible tactics of men who have concentrated all the forces of superb erudition on the fatal work of uprooting from simple souls the foundation of Christian belief. I have in my mind the methods of a Catholic *conferencier* who put before a popular audience the *Greek text* of the Gospel variants which deal with the institution of the Holy Eucharist, and failed to give an adequate explanation of the complicated position, creating thus a Babel of discordant voices around the sacred mystery of Christian peace.

The formal purpose of the work of apology can never be to bring into evidence the reading and critical acumen of the preacher; the work is a supreme proof of charity and is crowned only when it issues in consolidating the bases of popular devotion to our common Faith.

The preaching of what are called "moral sermons" is thought to be the peculiar feature of those pastors who dread the more formidable work of expounding the dogmatic teaching of the Church. Many who consider themselves unfitted for the examination of the subtleties of doctrine, readily undertake the apparently easier task of instructing their flock in the matter of practical duty, and regularly preach on the ethical obligations of a Christian life. That stress is laid,

and must be laid, on this section of pastoral duty, goes without saying. But only when formal truth issues in good living and dogma guides and directs the free activities of the people, then, and then alone has religion perfected its work and assumed its full primacy over all the faculties of the soul. That this should be accomplished the mind and will must be bound together, and a sufficient analysis must be given of the reasonable motives of right moral action.[11] A positive assertion of what is right does not always suffice to make reasonable the service of dutiful souls; touching appeals to the emotional nature do not go much further toward this end; to assure it we must find the means of making clear to the humblest hearer the processes of moral actions, the knowledge, the liberty, the intention which must accompany a human act before it assumes the dignity needed for a judicial sanction. How many pulpits tell the people the first principles of moral theology? Who seems to care whether they know the place of the intellect, necessarily bound by evidence, and of the will, essentially free when dealing with the phenomena of daily choice? How many of us have taken the trouble to touch these great preliminary topics in our pastoral sermons? Yet how interesting it would be for souls who are so often lost in the labyrinths of moral action, to grasp these salient points of reasonable ethics!

If we pass on to the treatment of conscience, it is evident that we find here a field for interesting and important instruction. The measure of the incidence of law is found in individual conscience, and it follows that a full and intelligible analysis of this faculty corresponds to an absolute need of the people. The various divisions of it, as given in our manuals, are trite and obvious to us, but they will come as revelations to the crowd of souls who have had no training in these subtle inquiries. If you put to an ordinary man the query, "What is the concrete norm of right action?" I should wager ten to one, that he will answer, "The norm of right action is found in the right appreciation of immediate duty."

[11] *Catechismus Romanus*, Pars tertia, Cap. I.

One may judge of the fatal consequences of such a theory if reduced to practice, which, by the way, rarely takes place, as the defective intellectual act is corrected by the unconscious logic that often guides so well the course of life.

Proceeding in our course we come to the tract on law, which is the objective of moral rectitude, and this also lends itself easily to homiletic treatment and will become a source of interest and even of delight to an inquiring Christian community.

If the preacher goes to the root of the matter and puts clearly into view the eternal Law, as the absolute, though remote, basis of ethics, and shows how this is necessarily identified with the reality of things, and assures the accomplishment of their final purpose, he may not bring home his teaching to the slower minds of his backward audience, but he will interest in a supreme degree the many who in our times are seeking for a rock to rest upon for the secure maintenance of their religious life.

The argument will then lead him to point out the relations between this remote principle and the function of positive law; he will make evident the *ratio* of all human legislation, and at the same time the scope of positive divine ordinances, and, in so doing, he will throw light upon the great evolution of the principle of law and prove its essential righteousness and beneficent purpose.

If he passes now to the examination of, for instance, the Decalogue, he has secured the foundations of a scientific treatment of the questions that most immediately touch the very life principles of any well-ordered society. The duty of supreme worship of the Diety will follow of itself from His Supreme Being, and the place of ecclesiastical ordinances fixing the ways and means of organized cultus will at once be perceived. The sanctity of the acts associated with His Name will come as the consequence of His invoked witness, and a sense of the sacredness of life and language cannot be doubted when all the actions of man have their absolute finality in the accomplishment of His will.

An examination of the day of rest will explain the reason of an ordinance which has become in our time a weekly habit, whose real meaning is obscured by its mechanical observance in every civilized country. It has, for most people, the simple proportions of a mere human device to assure to those who work a day's respite from the terrible law of labor, and, as such, it is adopted, nay, enforced by legislators who find their inspiration only within the narrow spirit of natural need.[12] They wish to assure the national energies the benefit of a day's rest, and the last meaning of a begrudged holiday is to secure the means of more strenuous toil; it is, in a word, *reculer pour mieux sauter*. And yet the real meaning is so obvious, and is so beautiful and sublime, that one wonders how humanity in its vagaries could have forgotten one of its earliest and most touching lessons. In fact, the shaping of material things that we strictly call labor, puts man in the attitude of bending over the object of his work; it rivets his mind upon the earth beneath him, as a condition of attention and success; and if the incidence of this universal law was continued, it would mean that the exigencies of life have the right to pin our souls to their unique service, and shut out of view those higher and farther things that give their ultimate meaning to a world that otherwise would be unintelligible. There is not only a law of work: there is a higher law that explains the fatigue, the want that accompany it, and brings a benediction upon the sweat and weariness of those who toil. Catholic ethics assure this higher law; it emancipates the laborer from the servitude of material occupation and sets a day apart, wherein he can lift up his eyes to Heaven that will be the reward of honesty, sobriety, and truth; where he may follow the details of the great Sacrifice which is the divine comfort of all who suffer and are weary with the burdens of their lot; it teaches him to open his lips in prayer, and puts him in personal relation with the Most High, who into the lowliest lives sends

[12] The Roman Catechism treats of the third precept of the Decalogue with great beauty and erudition, and lays special stress on the pastor's duty to bring home to his people's hearts the force of this divine law.

the light of His love and His hope; who promises to those who serve Him, when the night falls and the eternal Sabbath begins, the eternal rest of the Saints.[13]

The full treatment of the theological side of this question would greatly serve the spiritual good of the people; it would meet a growing danger that threatens the right use of the Sunday, and would give the people a means of estimating at its true value an institution which arises not only from economic-physical conditions, but from an imperious human necessity that embraces every side of our complex being.

Under the fourth precept of the Decalogue may be grouped not merely the divine sanction of the spontaneous piety we give our parents, but also the entire question of our relations with those in authority; the loyalty owed to those who exercise the superior power in the State, the obedience due to just laws, the limit of personal toleration of unjust legislation—these great questions call for treatment under this heading. No one can fail to see how delicate the handling of these problems should be in the pulpit. Anyone who should lightly undertake to speak of them and define the teaching of the Church in their regard, would expose himself and his congregation to risks whose practical results might be fatal to the best interests of the public. But that they should be fully and elaborately treated, who can doubt? If the ecclesiastical teacher has no strong direction to give on such living problems, he confesses himself bankrupt and should cease his teaching. If, for instance, in those Catholic countries in which there is schism between legislation and civic duty, there had been systematic training of the public conscience on the duties of citizenship in the matter of voting, and other charges of public life, it may be doubted whether the actual state of anarchy and political impotency of the Catholic body would have been so evident as they clearly are to-day. At any time this teaching of civics from a supernatural point of view would have formed a right spirit in the hearts of the people, but nowadays, when all legislative power is in the hands of the masses, this is more

[13] *Catechismus Romanus*, de tertio praecepto, art. 16.

evidently true, and a Church that remains silent and has no word of firm direction for the millions who really rule, guiding them in the correct exercise of their new power, has abdicated a great function, and failed in its mission to communicate the fullness of Catholic truth. This work must be done with tact and delicacy; but it must be done. The work of parliaments and public assemblies reacts too strongly and too directly upon the individual's life to be outside the jurisdiction of those who do the work of Christ in the world. The relations of Church and State touch the homes and consciences of everyone, the school question affects the process by which the tapestry of the national mind is woven into the beauty of the Divine purpose, or into the hideousness of a wretched naturalism, and such supreme interests are in the hands of the people who must, somehow, be taught to wisely use the mighty power that the evolution of society places in their grasp. This can only be done by systematic teaching of the Christian concept of society, and the fitting place for this work is the temple where God is worshipped and His will made known to His people.

Passing over the remaining precepts of the Decalogue, I should wish simply to note the great importance of a full and repeated explanation of the Seventh Commandment, so as to meet the needs of a society that grows more and more commercial every day. In this relation I think that a theory of prices should be carefully put before the congregation; the philosophy of contracts should be fully explained and thus a deeper sense of responsibility and honor would be instilled into the popular conscience. This will bring, also, into the daily contact with our spiritual obligations and sanctions the everyday details of life; men will feel that in all their activities they are stewards and not owners, even of themselves, and will one day have to render a full audit of the accounts of life to Him who is the Supreme Master.[14]

[14] The pastor should read and re-read the Roman Catechism on this precept; it traces the law into all its relations with civil life, and shows the fatal consequences of its violation to society as well as to individuals.

Such appears to me to be the line of duty for any priest who has accepted the care of souls. His calling gives him a supreme opportunity for moulding the popular conscience to the highest ideals of life, and the measure of his success must be the thoroughness with which he does the work assigned to him in the teaching Church. It will entail on men already fully formed for the ministry of souls continuous reading and sustained study: it may mean for others less equipped arduous labor and a long process of painful exercise before they can easily do their pastoral teaching with the fullness and completeness which I consider essential to its conscientious discharge; but it is the only way by which the people may enter into the possession of their Christian heritage and enjoy all the advantages of Catholic doctrine and firmly grasp the strong support of revealed truth. My view is a world apart from that system said to have obtained too long for the public good in some Catholic countries, which condemned the simple faithful to the weekly torture of hearing high-sounding sermons on scholastic questions that had no relation with life and its needs. My plan of pastoral instruction suggests the popular treatment of the fundamental truths, brings them within the ken of the common mind, translates the subtleties of the schools into the language of the people, and brings home to every section of society the great realities on which the Christian faith rests. It is difficult to understand why the riches of scientific apology should remain the privilege of a select few; or why those whose work is rooted and founded in charity, should retain for their own exclusive use and benefit what was meant for all the people, inasmuch as they are the ultimate object of the Church's solicitude, and their uplifting constitutes the glory of the Christian name.

A. WALSH, O. S. A.

Rome, Italy.

Insignia of Papal Knighthood

PONTIFICAL DECORATIONS.

ON the third of May of the present year Pope Pius X issued an Apostolic Letter making several new regulations for the Equestrian Order of the Holy Sepulchre. A little more than two years previously, 7 February, 1905, he had published a Brief whereby he practically established a new order of knighthood, and ordained radical and extensive changes in two of the existing orders. These evidences of papal solicitude toward "these societies of illustrious men which are both an ornament to the Church and a benefit to society and civilization," warrant a brief survey of the Papal Equestrian or Knightly Orders.

The Order of Christ.

The Supreme Military Order of Christ holds the first rank among the papal orders of chivalry. To quote the words of the recent letter of Pius X: "No other order shall be higher in dignity: it shall surpass the rest in excellence and honor." Its origin dates back to the year 1317 when King Dionysius I of Portugal created a body of Knights who pledged themselves to defend the kingdom against the attacks of the Moors. The statutes of the new Order were those of the Knights Templar, who had been suppressed a short time before (1312); and certain tenures of land in the name of the extinct Templars were likewise transferred to the Knights of the Order of Christ. Pope John XXII, who in 1319 had confirmed the charter of the Portuguese Knights, conceived the idea of establishing a similar Knighthood for Italy, and with this in view created in 1320 the *Ordine di Christo*. Its primary purpose became the defence of the interests of the Holy See. In 1605 Paul V, wishing to strengthen its spiritual, as distinct from its military, character, placed the Order under the direction of the Canons Regular of St. Augustine. During the subsequent era of the Temporal Power it was bestowed on magistrates and military officers of the highest rank only, there being but one class of the distinction, the precise character of which was probably best indicated by the collar formed

of alternate swords and tiaras, from which the decoration was suspended around the neck. There can hardly be any doubt that in reviving this Order of Knighthood in our day Pius X intended to emphasize his desire for a return of the chivalry ennobled by the spirit of Christ and the defence of His interest on earth. This design harmonizes perfectly with the motto by which the present Sovereign Pontiff inaugurated his reign: *Restaurare omnia in Christo.*

The decoration of the Order of Christ consists of a white enameled cross, bordered by an ornamented edging in red and gold (see design). A gold crown or military trophy surmounts the cross, and a wreath of oak leaves in enamel is attached to the lower extremity by a short black ribbon. The decoration is usually worn with the collar mentioned above, and the different links of the new design constitute a series of small shields displaying in turn the papal emblems and the cross of the Order. Worn as a badge on the right breast, the insignia consist of a small cross resting on eight silver rays set in diamonds. The uniform is the customary military tunic, white knickerbockers, and white shoes with gold buckles.

The Order of Pius IX.

The existing Order of this name was established by Pius IX, 17 June, 1847. Some regard this institution of the Pope as a revival of the Order founded in 1559 by Pius IV, and practically suppressed by the succeeding Pontiffs, Pius V and Gregory XIII, who revoked the privileges previously accorded to its members, and limited their titles to that of "Officials of the Apostolic Chamber."

According to the regulations issued by Pius IX there were but two classes of Knights in the Order, namely, Knight Commander and Knight Regular. At the time of their admission the members received a patent of nobility, which was merely personal for the ordinary Knight, but could be transmitted to the descendants of the Knight Commander. At the present day two additional grades are recognized, namely Knight of the Grand Cordon and Knight Commander with

the Plaque. At times this Order has been conferred on non-Catholics, as recently in the case of the Japanese Ambassador on whom Pius X bestowed the decoration in July of the present year.

The decoration, which hangs from a blue ribbon edged with red, is an eight-pointed star enameled in blue. In the center is a small white shield bearing the name of the founder, Pius IX, surrounded by the motto, "Virtuti et Merito." On the reverse is the date of the foundation of the Order, 1847.

The Order of St. Gregory the Great.

This Order, which is bestowed in recognition of distinguished civil or military services to the Holy See, was instituted by Gregory XVI in a Brief of 1 September, 1831. Three years later he modified the original statutes. Like the Pian Order, it has four classes: Knight of the Grand Cross, Knight Commander with the Plaque, Knight Commander, and Knight.

The emblem of the Order is a bifurcated, or eight-pointed, cross in red enamel. The name and image of St. Gregory the Great are displayed on a small blue shield in the center. The reverse side bears the name of the founder, Gregory XVI, and the inscription, "Pro Deo et Principe." A crown of oak leaves surmounts the cross given to civilians, while a military trophy adorns that worn by soldiers. The ribbon is red with yellow borders. The plaque, or badge, of silver rays reproduces the device shown on the cross.

The Order of St. Sylvester.

The Order of St. Sylvester is one of the oldest and most highly prized of papal decorations. Its reputed founder was Pope St. Sylvester in the days of the Emperor Constantine. It was then known as the Order of the Golden Spur, or the Golden Militia. The members had many notable privileges, among them being the right to style themselves Counts of the Holy Lateran Palace. As the years went by, it gradually lost caste because it was bestowed too lavishly and without discrimination. Pope Gregory XVI, 31 October, 1841, reorganized the Order and gave it the title of the Order of St.

Sylvester. It had but two grades: Knight Commander and Knight. The Brief of Pius X of 7 February, 1905, entirely separated this Order from that of the Golden Spur, and established many new regulations for both.

Two new classes were added to the Order by the present Pope, namely, Knight of the Grand Cross and Knight Commander with the Plaque. The decoration, which varies in size for the different classes of Knights, consists of an eight-pointed gold cross with the surface in white enamel. In the center is the image of Pope St. Sylvester. On the back, within a blue circle, are the papal emblems and the dates of the present and the Gregorian restorations, 1905 and 1841. The plaque is formed of a similar cross resting on a silver star. The ribbon is red with black stripes.

The uniform of the Knights comprises a black silk tunic with a single row of gold buttons and embroidered collar and sleeves. The knickerbockers also are black. The papal colors are shown in the cockade of the chapeau, which is further adorned by a white or black plume in the case of Knights of the Grand Cross or Knight Commanders. A gilt belt supports a sword with a mother-of-pearl hilt.

The ordinary Knight wears the decoration on the left breast, while the larger cross of the Commander is suspended from the neck. The Knight of the Grand Cross has a still larger cross of the same design hanging from a ribbon worn over the right shoulder. The large badge of a Grand Cross and the smaller one of a Commander are attached to the left breast.

THE GOLDEN MILITIA, OR ORDER OF THE GOLDEN SPUR.

This Order, which had been merged into the Order of St. Sylvester by Gregory XVI, was completely disassociated from it by Pius X, who, mindful of the ancient and glorious traditions of the Golden Militia, wished not only to restore it to its former position of honor, but also to endow it with new splendor. As none of the existing Orders of the Church was under the patronage of the Mother of God, Pius X, in mem-

ory of the Golden Jubilee of the proclamation of the Immaculate Conception, placed this newly-revived Order under the protection of the Immaculate Mother of God. It has but one class of Knights, whose number is never to exceed one hundred. Membership in this Order is to be restricted to those who by force of arms, by writings, or noble deeds, have promoted Catholicity, or defended the Church of Christ by their valor, or illuminated it by their learning. The privilege of nobility and the title of Count of the Lateran Palace, which the Knights formerly received, are now abolished, and they are henceforth to be esteemed for their personal merits only.

A gold spur hangs pendent from the cross, which is eight-pointed and faced with yellow enamel. In the centre a small white medal bears the name "Maria." On the reverse is the inscription "Pius X Restituit," together with the date 1905. A gold trophy projects above the cross. The decoration is suspended from the neck by a red ribbon with white edges. At the left breast is the badge, which is similar in design to the cross. It rests on silver rays.

The uniform of the Knights is composed of a red tunic ornamented with a double row of gold buttons and relieved at the collar and sleeves by black silk facings embroidered with gold thread. The epaulettes are fringed with white and display the emblem of the Order. A two-peaked chapeau, showing the papal colors, black knickerbockers, gold spurs and buckles complete the details. The sword rests in a black scabbard.

THE ORDER OF THE HOLY SEPULCHRE OF JERUSALEM.

According to its traditions this illustrious Order was founded in 1090 by Godfrey of Bouillon, King of Jerusalem. It is, therefore, the oldest existing order of chivalry. It was an offshoot of the Knights Hospitallers of St. John, and was approved by Pope Paschal II in 1113 and placed under the protection of the Holy See. The Order lost its ancient prestige after the fall of Jerusalem, but was restored to honor in 1496 by Alexander VI in order to recompense the rich and

noble for the perils and privations of a pilgrimage to the Holy Places. He ordained that the Roman Pontiff should be the supreme head of the Order, but delegated to the Apostolic Commissary of the Holy Land the power to confer the cross on new members. This delegation was to last until the re-establishment of the then suppressed Latin Patriarchate of Jerusalem, when the right was to revert to the Patriarch. The restoration of the Patriarchate took place toward the close of the year 1847, and the decree of Alexander VI was carried into effect by Pius IX. The same enactment is found in the recent Letter of Pius X (3 May, 1907), who therein constitutes the Patriarch the *Locum Tenens*, or Administrator, for the Supreme Pontiff, with power and authority to admit new members to this high honor.

Pius IX in a Brief of 24 January, 1868, revised the ancient statutes of the Order and divided the Knights into three classes, namely, Knight of the Grand Cross, Knight Commander, and Knight. The present Pontiff has practically constituted a fourth class of allowing the plaque to be worn by some of the Commanders in recognition of their special merits. All the Knights have the right to the title of Counts of the Holy Lateran Palace. By a concession of Leo XIII (3 August, 1888) this decoration may be conferred on ladies, who are then to be styled " Matrons of the Holy Sepulchre."

The emblem of the Order is a red-enameled gold cross with smaller crosses of the same design at the extremities of the arms. Pius X in his recent Brief permits the cross to be suspended from a military trophy by a black *moiré* silk ribbon. He also prescribed a white woollen cloak with a red cross embroidered in the right side. The badge is an eight-pointed star displaying a red cross surrounded by oak and laurel branches in green enamel. A Grand Cross wears the badge on the left breast, and a Commander on the right breast. The collar, which is used only on occasions of great solemnity, is formed of small Jerusalem crosses joined by links of burnished gold.

For the purpose of expediting the affairs of the Order,

Pius X sanctioned the delegation of certain Knights as local representatives of the Patriarch according to the needs of the different regions. These national Deputies, as a mark of their office, wear the Cross in the middle of the breast when in uniform, and on the right side when in civilian garb. Should any vacancy occur in the Patriarchate, the urgent general business of the Order is to be transacted by the Roman Deputy.

The Medal "Pro Ecclesia et Pontifice."

To the foregoing Knightly Orders we may add the Medal "Pro Ecclesia et Pontifice," which was established by Pope Leo XIII, 17 June, 1888, as a souvenir of his sacerdotal Jubilee. This medal was destined for those who had notably co-operated in the success of the Jubilee celebration by organizing pilgrimages, or by other special services, which, however, the Pontiff did not wish to reward by membership in one of the equestrian orders. Ten years later, in October of 1898, he made it a permanent institution, to recompense those who had performed important services for the Church or its august head.

There are three kinds of medals: gold, silver, and bronze. In shape they are cruciform with lilies springing from the angles. At the extremities of the cross-arms are comets, which with the lilies form the arms of the Pecci family. In the center is a medallion bearing the name and image of Leo XIII. On the reverse are the papal emblems and the motto, "Pro Ecclesia et Pontifice," and, at the foot, the date 1888. It is worn at the left breast and is pendent from a purple ribbon showing the papal colors, yellow and white, at the borders.

In addition to these orders the Pope frequently grants titles of nobility to those who have deserved well of the Church. These titles vary in degree from prince to baron, and may be either personal or hereditary. The title of Count Palatine, or Count of the Lateran Palace, is attached to many offices in the Papal Court.

Joseph J. Murphy.

Philadelphia, Pa.

THE ENCYCLICAL ON THE TEACHINGS OF MODERNISTS IN OUR SEMINARIES.

IT would be impertinent to make any attempt at explaining the recent Encyclical Letter on what has been styled "Modernism." The term as vulgarly accepted is somewhat misleading, and has been construed by those who look merely upon the surface of things as identical with progress in science, that is to say, with a gain in the understanding and uses of truth. A more accurate definition, however, of the word as referred to in the papal document implies the idea of a deviation from methods heretofore employed in the process of reasoning to arrive at truth, and of an attempt to substitute other methods less safe, though perhaps more brilliant and captious because they are bound up with what is novel and closer to our daily sense and seeming experience.

It is this sort of "Modernism" that the Pope analyzes, exposes, and brands. And he does it with such a masterly completeness, such clearness and penetration, that what appears at first sight to be merely an exhortatory address, is seen on closer examination to be a compendium of theological doctrine setting forth not only the fundamental truths and facts of Christian faith, but also fashioning their exposition to suit the modern temper of mind, to meet the objections of modern science, and to strengthen the apologetic position of the Catholic Church amid the distracting controversies of the day. Hence the Encyclical, far from being a protest against modern science or the advancement of intellectual inquiry, is the very opposite, namely, a defense of the eternal truths—for these, like the light of day, are ever new, however old—which the experience of generations has attested, with the weapons of philosophical analysis such as will confute the modern sceptic who wraps himself in a blaze of artificial lights, and dazzles the sight of the weak-eyed by the glamor of his footlight reflections. The restless inciters of intellectual warfare, modern as well as ancient, against religion, have always used the trick of calling their inventions of intellectual pride by some name that would indicate their efforts to

uphold what in sooth they meant to destroy by their opposition. The old truth observed by Quintilian—the *lucus a non lucendo,* illustrated by Varro, who derives *canis a non canendo*—repeats itself when it tells us that the "*Orthodox* Greek Church" is in reality the schismatical or *heterodox* body of Russians who have abandoned orthodox Christian teaching to retain only the traditions which foster fanaticism or superstition. In like manner recent Church history in Germany has classified the "*Old* Catholics" of Döllinger's patronage as the *newest* sect that sprang up and died from a protest against the Vatican decrees of the ancient See of Peter. So, too, our "modernist" theologians and scientists are professors of old errors that are merely fashioned to suit modern weaknesses, and brightened and decked out in brilliant covers. And the new sounds of "vital immanence," of "subconsciousness," of "fideism," have a charm in their buzzing for the childish or insane ears of those who prefer to feed their faith on phenomena rather than upon realties. When one lifts the shroud whence these sounds proceed, one finds a swarm of creatures that belongs to the genus anciently known as atheism, agnosticism, sentimental pantheism, and the thousand vagaries which these everlasting parasites generate.

The object of this paper is, therefore, not to analyze or comment upon the Encyclical on "Modernism," but simply to point out why it deserves more than a transient reading, however attentive and intelligent the reader be; and next to suggest that its study might be fruitfully taken up in our classes of theology, for the benefit of those who are soon to be ordained. For it has two signal merits which place it above all kindred documents that have come to us in recent years with the authority of the supreme *magisterium* on earth. In the first place it presents to us a summary of the philosophical and theological errors which have infested the field of Catholic apologetics, and with which every priest, every teacher of Christian doctrine, every cultured layman who feels that he is bound to use his culture in the defense of Christian truth and morals, must come into

more or less direct conflict in this day and country. Christ, when speaking of the searching judgment which He is to pass upon the latest age of progress, said:[1] "When the Son of man cometh, shall He find, think you, faith on earth?" In this saying our Lord prepared as well as warned us against the false assumption that what is termed modernism may be confounded with progress in the attainment of the end for which we have been created.

The errors, philosophical and theological, here stigmatized as "Modernism," had already been outlined in the recent Syllabus. The Encyclical not merely recounts them, but traces them to their sources, familiarizes us with their mutual relations and dependences, and points out the injury to wholesome intellectual life and sound morals which such sources must of necessity produce. To the exposure of the false doctrine that is propagated under the plea of applying a broader and higher philosophical criticism to revealed religion than has hitherto been possible, the Pontiff joins the reasoned reassertion of Catholic truth, based on unquestionable motives of credibility. Thus he takes us back, as is meet, through the maze of erroneous assumptions and inferences presented by the "modernist" school of theology, to the fundamentals both of supernatural revelation and of that sound reason which draws its conclusions from the legitimate criteria of truth, the external and internal senses, and the testimony of history. God is known and knowable. His revelation of Himself attests the mysteries of the Holy Trinity, the Incarnation, the Atonement. The historical testimony, tradition inspired and non-inspired, the fruits of holy living in the domain of moral, intellectual, and distinctly spiritual life, vouch for the institution and the efficacy of the sacramental system in the Church; and this in turn corroborates the doctrinal and magisterial authority of the hierarchical institution which acts and speaks under the continual guidance of the Holy Spirit.

All this we find outlined in logical order and then con-

[1] St. Luke 18: 8.

trasted with the incoherent and inconsistent arguings of the so-called "modern" school of thought, ethics, and religion. Having passed over this ground of conflicting doctrines, the Pontiff enters separately upon the present and immediate causes of the errors and the mutual antagonism they beget. The curiosity that pries after new things, and the pride of life that resents the yoke of Christ, sustain each other in the instructive and arrogant questioning of the rights of authority. To these dispositions of popular unrest and criticism there allies itself the feverish activity of propagandism which uses every available means of injecting the poison of error and rebellion into the body social. They are not, of course, new agencies of evil, any more than the doctrines which they undertake to propagate are new: but the methods of organized activity, of rapid transmission of speech and writing in the manifold appliances which mechanical progress has rendered possible and agreeable in these times, increase the power of, and give a new impetus and entering wedge to, the evil.

Now the Sovereign Pontiff wishes us to use in the defense of the eternal inheritance, the divine deposit of faith, the same weapons as the enemies of religion, open and disguised, employ in their destructive attacks upon that heritage. Hence in the third part of the Encyclical he points out the means which every loyal son and defender of the Catholic Church, every earnest lover of souls in the sacred ministry, every wise householder in the Kingdom of Christ, must adopt for the safeguarding of our common cause. The first of the remedies is study, a study not so much of things as of their reasons and causes, of truth and the ways of testing it, of science rather than of sciences, of principles on which to base our judgments, and of methods by which securely to arrive at the just application of principles. And, whatever shallow minds may say of the scholastic system, that system has thus far alone stood the test of critical analysis and secure adaptation. No doubt, there is much loaded into the vehicle of scholastic philosophy which is the mere "truck" of professorial tradition; but the basis is sound, sounder than any system of thought and rea-

soning that modern investigation and experience has been able to evolve. No one who reads the Encyclical can retain any doubt that the Pontiff desires a thorough use on the part of Catholic students of all that modern science can furnish as a test for the present application of the scholastic method in the investigation of the higher, that is, moral truth. "Apply yourselves," he writes, quoting the words of his predecessor in the defense of the same cause, "to the study of the natural sciences, the splendid discoveries, and the wonderful as well as practical use that has been made of them in these days;" indeed, he justly blames Catholic teachers for having sometimes neglected to take due account of these acquisitions in their apologetics. Hence the bishops are exhorted to see that their clergy be rightly trained, that the priest be a man of learning no less than of religion and piety.

Other precautions and safeguards of orthodox truth are pointed out in the diocesan power to control the intellectual food supply, to provide spiritual medicines, healthy recreation for the mind, in behalf of the souls entrusted to the keeping of the bishops. The question of censorship is one of great difficulty in its practical application amid the various secular influences which surround Catholics, especially in missionary countries. But vigilance and a thoughtful exercise of the opportunities of instruction in church and school can effect what the Pontiff wishes, *in omni patientia et doctrina.*

Perhaps the most important feature, because it promises to give effect to the Encyclical, is that of the triennial report, which, under oath, the Ordinaries will be bound to make of what they have accomplished or attempted within their folds for the correction of the evils indicated, according to the methods prescribed by the Pontifical Letter.

Pius X may sometime come to be known as eminently the man of action. He has already exposed and cut at some deeply embedded traditions which had entwined their roots with those of more useful trees, and were stealing the sap and vigor of many a healthy religious growth. His laws are not instructions merely, but checks likewise that are bound to

exert an influence for good in Catholic public life. If we wish to make real progress in reform for Christ's Kingdom, we must above all imitate the Pontiff in these two things: Begin at home, and control the action of the law by a system of visitation which makes every agent responsible for the title he claims and the living he earns. The Catholic temper more than perhaps any other is susceptible and sensitive, and the obligation of " informing " is repugnant; for Catholics in every land and in every age have been the victims of informers against them, suffering for conscience' sake; and the very idea of reporting a brother in disgrace is distasteful, especially to the Celt and the Slav of our own day. But there are limits to fraternal attachment; and they are defined by the higher law which the Founder of our holy religion indicated when He bade His disciples renounce father and mother, brother and sister, if they would be worthy of Him.

The title of this paper calls for the thought of the seminary in connexion with our subject. I have said that the Encyclical presents a very clearly defined and deftly connected summary of the principal topics which confront the modern apologist of the Catholic religion. Besides being a summary, however, it illustrates a very effective method of how the topics in their relations and mutual dependence may be treated. Hence this very Encyclical offers itself as an admirable medium of training and illustration in our classes of apologetics in the theological seminary. Many of our professors, and not a few of our students who are alive to the meaning of passing controversies in philosophy and religion around us, feel a sense of dissatisfaction with the old textbooks of theology. They are unimpeachable in the matter of orthodoxy; but they often fail to touch the level on which we walk. They take us to a subterranean place and a long-past age, and though the truths and errors they discuss are quite as alive to-day as in the days of the Montanists and the Arians, and in the so-called reform age of the Lutherans and Calvinists, yet we do not recognize them by the old names or in the old dress. Hence, when our young theologian comes to meet

the heroes of the "New Theology" and the "Immanence" advocates, he is quite puzzled, and keeps his peace, thinking that he knows nothing of them, and wonders in what magazine he will get a thorough exposition of these new heresies, with their specious difficulties which he hears condemned in the Syllabus and in Pontifical Letters. The fact is, as the Pope clearly points out, these are old; old heresies under new names, with new processes of evolution to dress them up, with new and captious advertisements to commend them and their authors. And the multitude of soul-sick people run and clamor after them and buy the new nostrums, just as a man plagued with liver complaint is apt to believe in and try the cheap patents advertised in his daily newspaper.

Now if the professor of theology or apologetics were to take this Encyclical, which makes a moderate-sized booklet of fifty printed pages, he would have an ideal text-book. From it he may teach students the things they will need very much more than all the commendable patristic and historical lore that lies before him in the volumes by the great masters of the past in whom we justly place our confidence. The fundamental problems of religion which at present occupy the minds of thoughtful men are briefly and pointedly set forth, so as to meet the viewpoint of the philosopher, the believer, the theologian, the historian, the critic, the apologist, and the reformer; for it is in these various rôles that the antagonist meets the Catholic truth. We might, therefore, wisely and profitably put this document into the hands of our seminarists, and devote the critical year of their studies, when they are about to face the practical issues of the sacred ministry, to an exposition of it, part by part, and in its connexion with the various purposes which the Pontiff has in mind. For the Encyclical not only teaches, but it also directs; that is to say, there is a practical element in it which becomes an important adjunct to our Canon Law. That the details, especially those regarding the "modernist" doctrines, require more thoughtful treatment than the mere reading of an untrained mind, must be evident. But the teacher finds indicated in the Letter

all that he needs to put him in possession of the material which will elucidate his subject.

If the professors in our seminaries would take up this course of action there would necessarily arise a sort of unity of sentiment, expressed in pulpit and writing, helpful in correcting the evils of which the Encyclical and every right-minded Christian justly complains as poisoning the intellectual and moral atmosphere of our schools. What is done in the seminaries might be done, therefore, in a modified way in our catechetical schools, in the reading-circles of our young men and women who aim at true progress illumined by the teaching of the Church of Christ—the *Lux mundi in aeternum.*

Analecta.

LITTERAE APOSTOLICAE.

I.

DE CONSTITUENDO RUTHENI RITUS EPISCOPO PRO CIVITATIBUS FOEDERATIS AMERICAE SEPTENTRIONALIS.

Delegatio Apostolica, Statuum Foederatorum Americae Septentrionalis.

Die 16 Septembris, 1907.

No. 15750.—c.

Illme ac Revme Domine,

Mandatis mihi a SSmo Domino Nostro Pio Divina Providentia Papa X, commissis, libentissime obsequens, Amplitudini Tuae exemplar Litterarum Apostolicarum, "Ea semper," de constituendo Rutheni Ritus Episcopo in Civitatibus Foederatis Americae Septentrionalis, heic inclusum, transmitto, cum eas, prout in iisdem Litteris cautum est, nuper sollemniter promulgaverim.

Non dubito quin Amplitudo Tua omnia et singula in eis contenta sedulo observaverit, atque observanda curaverit.

Quaeque fausta a Deo Amplitudini Tuae adprecans, permaneo

Addictissimus in Christo,

L. * S.

† DIOMEDES, Archiep. Larissensis,
Delegatus Apostolicus.

Pivs Episcopvs

SERVVS SERVORVM DEI.

Ad Perpetuam Rei Memoriam.

Ea semper fuit Apostolicae Sedis peculiaris quaedam ac propria sollicitudo ut varii ac diversi, quibus exornata splendet catholica Ecclesia, diligenter custodirentur ritus, quemadmodum provisa plura et statuta a Decessoribus Nostris, in venerabiles maxime liturgias Orientalium Ecclesiarum, perspicue declarant.

Iam, illud Nobis enarratur, Ruthenos catholicos, numero plurimos, ex Hungaria et Galicia in Civitates Foederatas Americae Septentrionalis migrasse, suâque ibi collocata sede, complura sibi comparasse templa, singularum dioecesium probantibus Episcopis, iisdemque, ut par est, sacra eos potestate moderantibus. Dignam sane quae maximis extolatur laudibus, eorum caritatem Praesulum arbitramur, qui, summo studio miraque sollicitudine, catholicis dissimili ritu filiis praesto adhuc esse non desivere. His quidem Episcopis visum est, facilius posse Ruthenorum ritum adservari integrum et consentaneo decore administrari; posse etiam fideles Ruthenos, hoc tali accedente praesidio, efficacius contra pericula armari, quibus, schismaticorum civium opera, patent, si Episcopus iisdem ritus rutheni detur. Nos autem eiusmodi amplexi sententiam, rationumque, quas supra memoravimus, permoti momentis, id consilii suscepimus, Episcopum deligere ac nominare, qui, potestate opportune instructus, illud enitatur et contendat ut ritus graecus ruthenus, variis in missionibus Foederatarum Civitatum, incorrupte servetur.

Huius Episcopi munus quo aptius cum ordinaria iurisdictione Episcoporum cohaereat qui iis praesunt dioecesibus ubi Ruthenorum sodalitates sitae sunt, quaedam Nos, de sententia Venerabilium Fratrum Nostrorum sacri Consilii Christiano Nomini Propagando negotiisque orientalis ritus cognoscendis, statuenda, pro rei gravitate, censuimus, id certo rati, horum adiumento praescriptorum, nihil assequendis commodis obstiturum, animorumque concordiae, quae debet viros e sacro ordine populosque utriusque ritus coniungere, iri consultum.

CAPVT I.

De Episcopo Rutheni Ritus.

Art. I. Nominatio Episcopi rutheni ritus pro Civitatibus Foederatis Americae Septentrionalis, Apostolicae Sedi est omnino reservata.

Art. II. Episcopus rutheni ritus sub immediata huius Apostolicae Sedis iurisdictione ac potestate est, ac sub vigilantia Delegati Apostolici Washingtoniensis. Iurisdictionem autem ordinariam nullam habet, sed tantummodo sibi delegandam a singulis Ordinariis in quorum dioecesi Rutheni commorantur. Eius officium est circa ritus rutheni integritatem vigilare, sacra olea pro Ruthenis conficere, ecclesias rutheni ritus dedicare, Confirmationem Ruthenis ministrare, pontificalia in ecclesiis Ruthenorum peragere, et, praehabitis in singulis casibus litteris dimissoriis Ordinarii loci, clericos rutheni ritus ordinare.

Art. III. Salvo iure et officio Ordinarii loci, Episcopus rutheni ritus visitationem missionum ruthenarum inire poterit, praehabita in scriptis licentia eiusdem Ordinarii, qui illi conferet facultates quas concedendas iudicaverit.

Art. IV. Episcopus rutheni ritus in visitatione rationes ab unoquoque rectore missionis exposcet administrationis bonorum missionis eiusdem, curabitque ne rector nomine ac iure proprio ea retineat, pro quorum acquisitione fideles quovis modo subsidia contulerint; simul autem operam dabit, ut iuxta leges sive dioecesanas, sive constitutas in III Plenario Concilio Baltimorensi, ea bona vel quamprimum transferantur sub nomine Ordinarii loci, vel alio tuto ac legali modo ab eodem Ordinario approbando firmiter adscripta sint et maneant favore missionis.

Art. V. Peracta visitatione, Episcopus rutheni ritus certiorem faciet de statu morali et de oeconomica administratione missionis visitatae Ordinarium loci, qui opportune decernet quae ad bonum missionis in Domino expedire censuerit.

Art. VI. Controversiae, si quae exoriantur inter Episcopum rutheni ritus et Episcopos dioecesanos, deferantur, in devolutivo tantum, ad Delegatum Apostolicum Washingtoniensem, salva, item in devolutivo, appellatione ad Apostolicam Sedem.

Art. VII. Donec aliter ab Apostolica Sede decernatur, ordinaria residentia Episcopi ritus rutheni erit in urbe Philadelphia.

Art. VIII. Ad constituendam annuam stipem pro sustentatione Episcopi ritus rutheni concurrere debent singulae ruthenae communitates, eidem solvendo annuam praestationem instar cathedratici, iuxta praxim et normas vigentes in dioecesibus Civitatum Foederatarum, in quibus missiones ruthenae constabilitae inveniuntur.

Art. IX. Episcopus rutheni ritus tertio quoque anno plenam et accuratam relationem de statu personali, morali ac materiali Missionum proprii ritus exhibeat Delegato Apostolico Washingtoniensi, qui eam transmittet ad Sacram Congregationem de Propaganda Fide pro Negotiis Ritus Orientalis.

Capvt II.

De Clero Rutheno.

Art. X. Cum nondum habeantur sacerdotes rutheni, qui vel nati vel saltem educati sint in Civitatibus Foederatis Americae; Episcopus rutheni ritus, praevia intelligentia cum Delegato Apostolico et Ordinario loci, omni studio curet, ut seminarium pro clericis ruthenis in iisdem Civitatibus Foederatis educandis quantocius instituatur. Interim vero clerici rutheni in seminaria latina locorum, in quibus nati sunt, vel domicilium acquisiverunt, admittantur. Sed nonnisi caelibes, sive nunc sive in posterum, ad sacros Ordines promoveri poterunt.

Art. XI. Antequam habeatur numerus sufficiens presbyterorum ruthenorum, qui in Civitatibus Foederatis Americae educati fuerint, si providenda occurrat de suo rectore aliqua missio Ruthenorum vel vacans vel noviter erecta, Ordinarius loci, audito, si ita existimaverit, Episcopo rutheni ritus, idoneum sacerdotem ruthenum illic iam morantem ipsi praeficiat. Si nullus idoneus in dioecesi habeatur, ipsum postulet ab alio Episcopo Civitatum Foederatarum. Si vero nullum inibi inveniat, de re certiorem reddat S. Congregationem de Propaganda Fide pro Negotiis Ritus Orientalis, cui curae erit providere.

Art. XII. Sacerdos eligendus, sit caelebs, vel saltem viduus et absque liberis, integer vitae, zelo ac pietate praeditus, satis eruditus, lucri non cupidus, et a politicis factionibus alienus.

Art. XIII. Sacerdoti ex Europa vocato praedicta Sacra Congregatio tradet documentum, quo ipsi concedatur facultas se conferendi in Civitates Foederatas Americae ad assumendam spiritualem curam alicuius determinatae missionis ruthenae.

Art. XIV. Presbyteris ruthenis in America commorantibus penitus interdicitur, ne baptizatos Sacro Chrismate consignent; et si secus fecerint, sciant se invalide egisse.

Art. XV. Quilibet ruthenus sacerdos ex Europa proveniens et in Civitatibus Foederatis Americae commorans pro fidelium rutheni ritus spirituali cura, semper manebit incardinatus dioecesi originis; attamen Episcopus ruthenus originis iurisdictionem suam in eum nullimode exercebit quoadusque ipse in Civitatibus Foederatis commorabitur. In patriam autem supra dicti sacerdotes redire nequeant absque expressa licentia Ordinarii Americani, in scriptis concedenda, in cuius dioecesi sacrum ministerium exercent. Quod si de una in aliam dioecesim Civitatum Foederatarum se conferre cupiant, requiritur consensus Episcopi *a quo* et *ad quem*, opportune facto certiore Episcopo rutheni ritus.

Art. XVI. Laici rutheni candidati ad Ordines, cuiuscumque originis et domicilii fuerint, illi dioecesi incardinati censeantur, a cuius Ordinario acceptati fuerint, et pro qua emiserint iuramentum missionis seu stabilitatis ad inserviendum in dicta dioecesi. Ab ea autem dioecesi, in qua incardinati sunt, in aliam transire nequeant, nisi praehabito consensu Ordinarii *a quo* et *ad quem*, ac opportune reddito certiore Episcopo rutheni ritus.

Art. XVII. Omnes rectores missionum ruthenarum Civitatum Foederatarum sunt amovibiles ad nutum Ordinarii loci, opportune effecto certiore Episcopo rutheni ritus. Amoveri autem non poterunt absque causis gravibus et iustis.

Art. XVIII. Datur tamen facultas presbytero amoto appellationem interponendi, in devolutivo, contra decretum remotionis ad tribunal Delegati Apostolici Washingtoniensis, qui intra tres menses a die appellationis causam definire curabit, salvo semper iure recursus ad S. Sedem, item in devolutivo.

Art. XIX. Sustentationi sacerdotis providebit communitas ruthena iuxta praxim et normas dioeceseos, in cuius finibus communitas invenitur.

Art. XX. Iura stolae et emolumenta sacri ministerii in singulis missionibus determinanda sunt ab Ordinario loci iuxta consuetudines locales, audito Episcopo rutheni ritus.

Capvt III.

De Fidelibus Ruthenis.

Art. XXI. Fideles rutheni iis in locis in quibus nulla ecclesia nec sacerdos ritus eorum habeatur, ritui latino sese conformabunt; eisque eiusmodi facultas conceditur etiam ubi propter longinquitatem Ecclesiae suae non eam possint nisi cum gravi incommodo adire: quin tamen ex hoc ritus mutatio inducatur.

Art. XXII. Laici rutheni, qui verum et stabile domicilium in Civitatibus Foederatis constituerint, transire possunt ad ritum latinum, obtenta tamen prius, in singulis casibus, venia Apostolicae Sedis.

Art. XXIII. Si contingat ut hi quandoque in patriam revertantur, tunc etsi ex Pontificio rescripto ritum latinum susceperint, licebit eis, Apostolica Sede exorata, ad pristinum ritum redire.

Art. XXIV. Non licet Missionariis latinis, sub poenis ab Apostolica Sede decernendis, quempiam Ruthenum ad latinum ritum amplectendum inducere.

Art. XXV. Fideles rutheni, etiam in locis in quibus adest presbyter rutheni ritus, apud sacerdotem latinum ab Ordinario loci approbatum peccata sua confiteri, et beneficium sacramentalis absolutionis valide et licite obtinere possunt.

Sciant autem sacerdotes rutheni ritus, censuras et reservationes casuum in dioecesi, in qua ministerium exercent, sive vigentes sive ferendas, clerum etiam et populum eiusdem rutheni ritus afficere.

Art. XXVI. Ad vitanda gravia incommoda quae inde Ruthenis evenire possent, facultas eis fit dies festos et ieiunia observandi iuxta consuetudinem locorum in quibus degunt. Attamen diebus dominicis, et festis in utroque ritu in eamdem diem incidentibus, sacrae liturgiae in ecclesia sui ritus, si in loco existat, Rutheni interesse tenentur.

Capvt IV.

De Matrimoniis Inter Fideles Mixti Ritus.

Art. XXVII. Matrimonia inter catholicos ruthenos et latinos non prohibentur; sed maritus latinus uxoris ruthenae ritum non sequatur, nec uxor latina ritum mariti rutheni.

Art. XXVIII. Si vero vir latinus in uxorem duxerit mulierem ruthenam, integrum erit mulieri ad ritum latinum, sive in actu matrimonii, sive postea, durante matrimonio, transire, quin electionem semel factam, vivente viro, revocare possit.

Art. XXIX. Soluto matrimonio, mulieri ruthenae, quae ritum mariti amplexa fuerat, resumendi proprii ritus libera erit potestas.

Art. XXX. Uxori ruthenae quae maluerit in proprio ritu permanere, licebit tamen in ieiuniis et festis suum maritum sequi.

Art. XXXI. Vir ruthenus potest, si velit, ritum uxoris latinae sequi, eique pariter licebit in ieiuniis et festis ritui uxoris latinae sese conformare. Soluto matrimonio, poterit in ritu latino permanere, vel ritum ruthenum resumere.

Art. XXXII. Matrimonium inter virum latinum et ruthenam mulierem latine coram parocho latino contrahatur; inter virum vero ruthenum et mulierem latinam contrahi potest vel ruthene coram parocho rutheno, vel latine coram parocho uxoris.

Art. XXXIII. Si uterque contrahens in suo ritu permaneat, competit presbyteris respectivi ritus officium parochi erga illos exercere in rebus quae hic recensentur, nempe: in communionis paschalis, viatici et extremae unctionis administratione, in adsistentia in mortis articulo, in exequiis persolvendis atque in humatione; excepto necessitatis casu.

Art. XXXIV. Nati in Civitatibus Foederatis Americae ex patre latino et matre ruthena, latino ritu sunt baptizandi; proles enim sequi omnino debet patris ritum, si sit latinus.

Art. XXXV. Si vero pater sit ruthenus, et mater latina, liberum erit eidem patri, quod proles vel ritu ruthèno baptizetur, vel etiam ritu latino, si in gratiam uxoris latinae ipse consenserit.

Art. XXXVI. Infantes ad eius parochi iurisdictionem pertinent, cuius ritu sunt legitime baptizati, cum per Baptismum fiat suscepti ritus latini vel rutheni professio, ita ut ad latinum ritum spectent qui latino ritu baptizati sunt; qui vero ritu rutheno sunt baptizati, in Ruthenorum numero sint habendi.

Excipitur casus quando iis Baptismus alieno ritu collatus fuerit ob gravem necessitatem, cum nimirum morti proximi fuerint, vel in loco, in quo parentes tempore nativitatis morabantur, parochus proprii ritus non adesset; tunc enim ad parochum ritus, quem parentes profitentur, pertinebunt, iuxta superius statuta.

In charitate Christi, qua fideles omnium rituum peramanter complectimur, haec statuenda censuimus pro spirituali bono animarumque salute fidelium ruthenorum in Foederatis Civitatibus Americae Septentrionalis commorantium; ac minime dubitamus quin ipsi Nostram hanc et Apostolicae Sedis erga eos sollicitudinem perfecta obedientia, imo et grato animo excipiant.

Praesentes Litteras et in eis contenta et statuta quaecumque, nulla unquam, licet privilegiata, ex caussa, colore et capite, nulloque unquam tempore de aliquo nullitatis vitio seu defectu inexcogitato et substantiali notari, impugnari aut in controversiam et iudicium vocari posse; sed tamquam ex Pontificiae Providentiae officio et Motu proprio, certa scientia, matura deliberatione, deque Nostrae Apostolicae Potestatis plenitudine editas, omnimoda firmitate perpetuo validas et efficaces existere et fore, suosque plenarios et integros effectus sortiri et obtinere, atque ab omnibus, ad quos spectat et spectabit, inviolabiliter observari volumus et decernimus, sublata cuicumque, etiam Cardinalitia dignitate fulgenti, quavis aliter statuendi et interpretandi facultate: irritum quoque et inane decernentes quidquid in contrarium scienter vel ignoranter contigerit attentari.

Quocirca Venerabilem Fratrem Diomedem, Archiepiscopum titularem Larissensem, Nostrumque apud Episcopos Civitatum Foederatarum Americae Septentrionalis Delegatum, executorem praesentium Apostolica auctoritate constituimus, ut ipse per se vel per alium virum ecclesiastica dignitate insignitum, ab eo subdelegandum, praesentes Nostras Litteras sollemniter publicet, ac omnia et singula in eis contenta a cunctis observanda curet. Eidem vero praecipimus ut singulorum actorum in praesentium evulgatione et executione exemplar authenticum intra sex menses ad hanc Apostolicam Sedem transmittat, illudque in Archivo S. Congregationis de Propaganda Fide pro negotiis Orientalis Ritus adservari mandamus.—Non obstantibus Decessorum Nostrorum Constitutionibus et Ordinationibus, etiam in generalibus et provincialibus Conciliis editis, et quarumcumque Ecclesiarum, etiam Patriarchalium, seu Ordinum et Congregationum, iuramento et confirmatione Apostolica vel quavis alia firmitate roboratis, statutis et consuetudinibus, aliisque quibuslibet, etiam Motu proprio, in contrarium praemissorum concessis, licet expressa mentione dignis; quibus omnibus, perinde ac si de verbo ad verbum his litteris inserta essent, ad praemissorum effectum specialiter

et expresse derogamus et derogatum esse volumus, ceterisque in contrarium facientibus quibuscumque.

Harum vero transumptis etiam impressis, manu tamen alicuius Notarii publici subscriptis ac sigillo personae in ecclesiastica dignitate constitutae munitis, eamdem ubique fidem haberi volumus, quae ipsis praesentibus haberetur, si forent exhibitae vel ostensae.

Nulli ergo omnino hominum liceat hanc paginam Nostrae constitutionis, decreti, mandati, voluntatis, exemptionis, derogationis, indulti, infringere vel ei ausu temerario contraire. Si quis autem hoc attentare praesumpserit, indignationem Omnipotentis Dei ac beatorum Petri et Pauli, Apostolorum eius, se noverit incursurum.

Datum Romae, apud Sanctum Petrum, Anno Incarnationis Dominicae millesimo nongentesimo septimo, decimo octavo calendas Iulias, die festo S. Basilii Magni, Pontificatus Nostri anno quarto.

A. Card. Di Pietro Pro-Dat.—R. Card. Merry Del Val.

Visa

De Cvria I. De Aqvila e Vicecomitibvs.

Loco ✠ Plumbi. Reg. in Secret. Brevium. V. Cvgnonivs.

II.

In Centenarium XV S. Joannis Chrysostomi.

Venerabili Fratri Nostro Vincentio S. R. E. Cardinali Vannutelli Episcopo Praenestinorum Praesidi coetus sollemnibus celebrandis saecularibus ab obitu S. Joannis Chrysostomi.

Pius PP. X.

Venerabilis Frater Noster, salutem et apostolicam benedictionem. Prope est ut diei memoria quindecies saecularis redeat quum actuosa vexataque multis modis vita Joannes Chrysostomus sanctissime cessit. Aetati huic nostrae, qua nullam oporteat magis ad illustria quaepiam instaurari exemplaria virtutum, gaudet animus insignem hunc virum posse iterum ad imitandum proponere. Siquidem plura ille in se vivendi genera, eaque singularibus plane luminibus laudum micantia, felicissime expressit. Nam, dum ad huc in laicorum coetu detineretur, vitam, et mores a saecularium consuetudine ita defendit, ut honestius non posset, donec a fluxarum studiis rerum totum se in divina recepit. Pastor autem Constantinopolitanae Ecclesiae datus, officia episcopalis muneris, nulla

hominum verecundia, nullo periculorum metu, diligentissime ac fortissime explevit.

Explanator denique nunciusque divinarum legum adeo coeteris in omnes partes praestare visus est, ut et Ecclesiae doctor sit habitus, et nomen ab aureo eloquii flumine invenerit; quare illum Leo XIII fel. rec. Decessor Noster dignum merito censuit quem sacris oratoribus exemplum simul ac patronum daret. Porro quum Orientalium Chrysostomus Ecclesiarum decus et gloria sit, mirum quantum consiliis Nostris Decessorumque Nostrorum conducere est existimandus, ut scilicet, quemadmodum ornamento Ille Romanae Ecclesiae diligendo ac defendendo extitit, ita consolationi extet, unitate tandem orientalium gentium Nobiscum monitis auspicioque Ipsius, redintegrata. Itaque palam est, Venerabilis Frater Noster, valde Nobis esse cordi sollemnia saecularia praeclarissimi Antistitis magnis sacri cultus coeremoniis haberi iisque non in universis modo Urbis templis quae Orientali utuntur ritu, verum etiam ad ipsam divi Petri Basilicam in monte Vaticano: nimirum expectatione tali permoti atque allecti, ut et elucentes in Chrysostomo virtutes populi admirentur atque imitentur, et ii qui a Nobis, Orientalibus e coetibus dissident, videant perspiciantque quam multam quamque germanam ritibus universis gratiam praestemus, inducantque demum animos optatis Nostris amanter obsequi, et antiquam matrem saluberrimo reditu amplecti. Quamobrem Beatum e vita discessum Joannis Chrysostomi volumus gratulatione maxima et cultu coli, hoc anno, plane singulari; gloriosamque sapientissimi Antistitis memoriam litteratorum etiam conventibus repeti. Ad animos vero excitandos acuendosque, id Nos libentissima voluntate pollicemur fore Nos, reseratis coelestibus thesauris, quotquot in deferendos Chrysostomo honores operam contulerint sacrarum indulgentiarum muneribus amplissime cumulaturos. Auspicem gratiae divinae Nostrique animi testem, apostolicam benedictionem, Tibi peramanter in Domino impertimus.

Datum Romae apud S. Petrum die XXII Julii anno MCMVII. Pontificatus Nostri quarto.

PIUS PP. X.

Studies and Conferences.

OUR ANALECTA.

The Roman documents for the month are:

ENCYCLICAL LETTER "De Modernistarum Doctrinis." (The full Latin text of this important pronouncement of the Sovereign Pontiff is given as a Supplement to this number of the REVIEW. See also the article on same, pp. 504-511.)

APOSTOLIC LETTER of 14 June, 1907, addressed to the Apostolic Delegate to the United States, in which letter Pope Pius X ordains that all Catholics of the Ruthenian (Greek) rite, resident in the United States, be placed under the care and direction of a bishop of the same rite, who is to receive his jurisdiction from the Ordinaries in whose dioceses he ministers. (The document is the subject of a separate paper in this month's issue: see pp. 457-467.)

LETTER of the Holy Father to Cardinal Vincent Vannutelli directing that the Fifteenth Centenary of St. John Chrysostom be fittingly celebrated.

THE TAKING UP OF THE COLLECTION BY THE CELEBRANT OF THE MASS.

A religious, ministering in a parish church of which another member of the same Order is rector, writes to us to say that when the latter recently desired him to leave the altar during the parochial Mass for the purpose of taking up a collection, he refused to do so, saying that he was asked to do what was against the law of the Church, whose laws he was bound to obey in preference to the wishes of the pastor. As the parish priest had been in the habit of collecting in this way, the difference in practice at the alternate Masses was likely to create comment among the congregation; hence, the younger priest,

not wishing to be marked as a "crank," and yet feeling a conscientious repugnance to adopt a practice which he considers forbidden by the Church, asks us to answer his doubt in the REVIEW.

Apart from a statement of the text of the law in this matter, to the observance of which law every priest pledges himself when the Church accepts him as her public minister, we should refer such doubts for settlement to the authoritative director—the Ordinary of the diocese, or, in the case of a religious, his Provincial. Obviously, our correspondent did not look in that direction for satisfaction or protection, a fact which can be explained only by the tacit approval which superiors occasionally feel compelled to give to practices that are not according to law.

On our own account, however, we would state that the above implied condition furnishes a sad commentary upon the respect alike for rule and authority. There is no doubt about the law—of God and of the Church—on the subject; and our own special legislation, although made in full view of the poverty-stricken condition of many missions in America, emphatically stigmatizes as "damnable and perverse" the action of pastors who stoop to the greedy task of tax-collectors, by interrupting the sacred offices of the Church at Mass in order to perambulate the aisles for the purpose of gathering alms from the faithful. We are not exaggerating.[1] The priests to whom the bishops would apply the words of the Council in public should feel disgraced with a deeper sense of shame than any crime of felony or extortion could bring upon a man reputed to be honest. And the Fathers of the Council saw plainly enough what they meant, for they add to the humiliating censure of the above-mentioned practice that they

[1] Damnavit perversam agendi rationem illorum sacerdotum, qui ipsa intra missarum solemnia ab altari recedunt, aedemque sacram circumeunt, a singulis fidelibus eleemosynam petentes. Tanta vero apparet quorumdam pertinacia ac in observandis etiam strictissimis legibus socordia, ut qui constituti sumus legum ecclesiasticarum custodes, alta voce decretum antecessorum nostrorum inculcare constringamur. Conc. Plen. Balt. III, Tit. IX, N. 293.

realize it to be "an abuse most shameful, which befouls the Church and her solemn rites, makes honorable Catholics blush with shame and indignation, and exposes the sacred ministry to derision and contempt." [2]

No doubt the matter does not offer so serious an aspect to those pastors who have grown up under conditions of irresponsible administration, or who, pressed by a thousand demands to liquidate a debt not always created by themselves, have gradually come to lose sight of the solemn call of their ministry and the awful solemnity required about the altar. But that does not change the law or the obligation of those who are bound to observe or to enforce the law.

To say that the assistant priest has not only the right, but the duty likewise, to refuse to take up a collection under such circumstances may seem like speaking the word for insubordination, which would be doubly injurious at a period when the claims of authority are easily disturbed by the popular view of rights. But it is plain that the system of making the church a mere resort for "performance" of Mass, in which the jingle of the money-box, and the appeal for larger contributions, and the thousand unworthy incidents which all this creates in connexion with the divine service, play a part, is simply detestable, whatever good we may otherwise have to say of the men who practise it.

THE LAW OF PRESCRIPTION IN REGARD TO INVALID APPOINTMENTS TO IRREMOVABLE RECTORSHIPS.

(*Communicated.*)

On reading in the October number on page 435 the article on "Invalid Appointments to Irremovable Rectorships" it occurred to me that in practice the solution of the difficulty will depend not only on the validity of the appointment, but also on Rule 36 of the Apostolic Chancery, and therefore I cite the following, from page 132 of *Legal Formulary*, fifth edition:

"It may be useful to quote substantially Rule 36 of the Apos-

[2] *Ibid.*

tolic Chancery which is applicable also in the United States and is intended to preclude by prescription controversy regarding possession of parishes and other benefices. 'Quicunque beneficium ecclesiasticum cum titulo saltem colorato bona fide per integrum triennium pacifice possidet, valide et licite in foro utroque illud retinere et a nemine amplius molestari potest, dummodo simoniace non obtinuerit.'"

Another point is, that only those who entered the concursus or applied for the parish can question the appointment to the benefice; the consequential rights of the position, such as a vote in suggesting names for the terna to fill the vacant see, may be questioned by any one present by right at the meeting called for that purpose, and the terna selected by aid of such a vote might be rejected as illegal. But after three years, according to "Lex de Triennali," this also is impossible, and the incumbent secures his full rights as rector both *de facto* and *de jure*.

P. A. BAART.

Marshall, Michigan.

APPOINTMENTS TO IRREMOVABLE RECTORSHIPS WITHOUT EXAMINATION.

Qu. As you have answered one question about irremovable rectorships, I request your decision on the validity of the following appointment:

On the death of an irremovable rector—one of the original appointments—a concursus was announced, and three applicants sent their names to the Right Rev. Bishop, signifying their intention to take the examination, if the Ordinary approved. They were informed that their application had been accepted and that they might prepare for the examination. Some time before the date fixed for the concursus, the bishop sent word to the three candidates that he had changed his mind, and that there would be no examination. Shortly afterwards he appointed his Vicar General to the vacant rectorship, though the latter had not entered the list of applicants before. Some of the priests maintain that the bishop exceeded his power, and that, since the concursus had been announced and proper applicants were found to be willing to present themselves for the examination, the

candidates had a right to compete for the position, and that the appointment in despite of them was illegal.

Resp. We see no reason to differ from the conclusion drawn by our correspondent, that the appointment thus made ignored the existing law. It may indeed be that a bishop feels a lack of confidence in the ability of any of the candidates who, under varying circumstances, apply for an irremovable rectorship; yet that if they pass the examination he is forced to appoint one from their number, to the exclusion of worthier and abler men who do not feel inclined to enter a contest for promotion with younger candidates. In such a case his only recourse is to persuade the worthier priests to apply, and to trust to the good sense of the examiners for the result. These can, if they agree by a majority, exempt the applicant from the literary examination. The Ordinary is then free to appoint his own choice.

These instances of deviation from the forms of actual law only demonstrate the necessity of a more thorough study of our Canon Law. Not only our seminary courses, but also the ecclesiastical Conferences should give occasion to familiarize the clergy with their rights as well as with their duties. Dr. Baart in his communication above refers to the law of prescription, which, according to a rule of the Apostolic Chancery, leaves a priest appointed to a benefice in possession after three years of peaceful incumbency. But how many of our priests are aware that they have a right to protest in such cases? And if their opportunities for knowing the rules and regulations are limited to a very meagre study of Canon Law in the last year of the theological course, and are not systematically improved later, how can they be expected to enter a protest against what must seem to be an arbitrary exercise of authority? "Peaceful possession" under such circumstances simply means that the parties who might be entitled to dispute an acquisition have been reduced to a hypnotic condition which keeps them inactive because they are not awake to their rights.

ANENT THE NEW DECREE CONCERNING CATHOLIC MARRIAGES.

Qu. 1. What delegation will assistant priests need, to assist at marriage ceremonies with a view to securing their validity? Our modern theologians treat of the matter quite exhaustively,[1] and though they refer to localities where the *Tametsi* is in force, the question whether the new decree in the matter of delegation does or does not follow the *Tametsi,* would appear to be an open one.

2. Again, the decree binds all who have been baptized as Catholics, though they may have fallen away from the Catholic faith. But will it not still be in order for a Catholic who wishes to marry a *pervert,* to get a dispensation "mixtae religionis", and for the pervert to sign the usual promises? This, of course, *pro liceitate.*[2]

Resp. 1. Since the terms of the decree do not particularly restrict the power of delegation in case of witnesses to the marriage, it may be assumed that its sense is general, and includes any priest whom the pastor or bishop recognizes as an accredited substitute in ordinary pastoral functions. "Generalis delegatio ad exercenda munia parochialia ad parochum supplendum facultatem assistendi matrimonium includit." Hence the assistant priests may be considered as having an understood right to act as authorized witnesses of all marriages, unless the pastor reserves that right to himself in exceptional cases. The *Tametsi,* although it furnishes points of analogy for the new legislation, does not necessarily communicate to the latter its binding force to the same extent.

2. As to the class of perverts who have strayed from, but who have not actually renounced, the Catholic faith, they must be treated according to their individual bias. A person baptized in the Catholic Church remains a Catholic, although he may be ignorant of his obligations or neglectful of them in

[1] *Cf.* Tanquerey, *De Poenitentia, De Matrimonio et Ordine;* Lehmkuhl, II, 556, n. 777; and there is a decree of the S. Congr. of the Inquisition given in the ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW which appears very pertinent.

[2] ECCL. REVIEW, Vol. XXI, p. 177.

the extreme, provided he does not deny his faith. Only when he abjures his faith by formally renouncing it as mere superstition and sentiment, or by joining some sect which implies a protest against Catholic doctrine, can he be said to have ceased to be a Catholic in belief. A person therefore who repudiates all religion, though baptized in the Catholic Church, would be regarded as a non-Catholic, and should be required on marrying a Catholic to give the same guarantees, for the preservation of the faith of the Catholic party and the education of the children in the Catholic faith, as are demanded from members of a Protestant sect. Such denial of the Catholic creed is not a mere negative quality but of the nature of a protest, even though it concern only one's own personal conviction. This is the force of the decree of the S. Office, 25 May, 1897, confirmed in 1899.[3]

WHAT IS HONEST BUSINESS?

Qu. The *London Standard*, commenting on President Roosevelt's Provincetown speech, and his condemnation of dishonest business methods, pertinently asks: "What is 'honest' business, and at what precise point do the methods of some modern companies cease to be honest? How he (Roosevelt) is to apply a moral test to questions of business, or where he will draw his line in regard to profits, is not easy to understand." This timely query recalls the fact that there are scores of questions involving the moral aspect of modern business methods, to which questions we priests are bound to find answers, and yet they remain unanswered. It is true that the general principles of the Tract *De Justitia*, must furnish the the basis of these answers. But most priests need formulas bearing more immediately on the points at issue. The "quaestiones" under *De Contractibus* furnish proximate rules applying to very few of these weighty doubts. For example: a man buys $1,000 of the stock of a large corporation. He knows nothing of its business methods, and takes no part therein, except possibly to sign a proxy delegating

[3] *Cf.* Eccl. Review, Aug. 1899, p. 177.

to other men (of whom he knows nothing) the right to vote for certain others (of whom he knows precisely as much) as managers of the company's business, which they conduct on the simple principle of making the dividends as large as possible. He contents himself with the knowledge that it is a good, safe investment, and with the receipt of yearly dividends of 15% or perhaps more. What moral right has he to those dividends? In which *subsectio* of the latest, most up-to-date moral theology can we find the moral test applied to that right? The dividend is certainly not a donation. Is it the interest on a loan? If so, by what right can he accept more than the legal rate of interest, on a safe investment? Are the principles of co-partnership to be applied? Then is not the stockholder bound to investigate the business methods of his managers? And if these are unjust, is he not guilty of injustice, if he does not prevent such methods? If he cannot, is he not bound to get out of the company as soon as possible? Is he not bound to restitution, perhaps even "in solidum," if the persons whom he allows to remain in control, commit injustice, compel employees to work for unfair wages, ruin competitors, etc., in order to pay him large dividends? Who can answer these questions, or inform the writer where the solution may be found?

Resp. Everybody will readily admit that it is difficult to draw an exact line between honest and dishonest business methods. The treatise on Justice is confessedly one of the most difficult in Moral Theology. It is of course desirable that the clergy should be able to get all needful help from their text-books of moral. Writers of those text-books are doing their best to keep pace with the rapid development and continual changes in modern business methods. A Manual of Moral Theology in English which the Messrs. Benziger have in hand may be adduced in proof of this. In the meantime what we think of more importance than up-to-date text-books of moral theology is a thorough grasp of moral principles. If those principles which are to be found in all the text-books are completely understood, there should not be much difficulty in solving such questions as our correspondent proposes. Let us see what principles are involved. The

principle that it is wrong to coöperate in doing evil shows that it is wrong to put $1,000 in a business whose guiding purpose is to make the dividends as large as possible. On the same principle it is wrong to put power into the hands of men and to make proxies of them when we know nothing of their moral character. A man may not content himself with the knowledge that an investment is safe and that it produces fifteen per cent or more. Hence it may be that the investor has no right to those dividends. Any text-book will tell us the duties of a possessor of another's property in good faith, or in doubtful faith, or in bad faith. The dividend is not a donation, nor is it a loan, but it represents the profits of partnership in a business. That business is perhaps conducted unjustly, perhaps justly; the details given do not enable us to decide which. The stockholder may as a rule presume that the business methods of the managers are in accordance with justice—*nemo praesumitur malus*—as the text-books say. If his reasonable suspicions about their methods are aroused, he must make inquiries, otherwise he acts with a doubtful conscience; and if the methods are found on inquiry to be unjust, he must withdraw from the business. If he does this as soon as his suspicions are aroused, he is not guilty of formal injustice, though he may be obliged to surrender a part of his unjust gains to the poor. But if he allows his agents to go on doing injustice in his name, with his money, and for his benefit, he will be bound to make restitution according to the rules laid down about coöperation in injustice.

Thus, we think, the formidable array of questions proposed by our correspondent may be answered without going beyond the pages of good, old Gury, or the more recent Sabetti. Only, and this is the chief point, their doctrine must be known and inwardly digested.

T. SLATER, S. J.

St. Beuno's College, England.

CATECHISMS.

(*Communicated.*)

We all seem to be in a reforming mood these days. It is felt that even the Breviary needs revision, as Dr. Scannell shows clearly enough in the September REVIEW. The attempts to reform the child's Catechism can no longer be numbered, and I suppose it must be admitted that finality in this matter is not yet in sight. We have admirable guides in method, among the best being the *Teacher's Manual*, of Philadelphia, but the compilation of a text-book seems to demand learning and pedagogy rarely found in the required combination.

There is a preliminary question that seems worth discussing Is it advisable to retain the form of question and answer? In other school books this form has been discarded. An Inspector of wide experience has said: "I never once found, in examining a school, that a subject—were it astronomy, history, geography, or heathen mythology—which had been taught by means of a catechism, had been properly understood by the learners." Some years ago it was thought that the thing needed was to make each answer in the Catechism a complete sentence, so that the answers alone would have to be learned by heart. Experience has proved this theory unfounded, possibly because it was only a half measure. In times long past, when the majority of those who taught Christian doctrine had little skill in the pedagogical art of questioning, the form of question and answer was no doubt necessary, or at least useful; but to-day it has perhaps outlived its usefulness.

I have taken at random a lesson of the Catechism, and, omitting questions, have written the information it conveys as nearly as possible in the words of the book. In this book the answers are seldom complete sentences, so that both question and answer must be committed to memory. As it stands in the book the lesson has 150 words. Without questions the same information is stated in 95 words. The burden to the pupil, represented by the difference, calls for some strong justifying reason; and in our day I am unable to find such a reason. The connexion of part with part is clearer in the questionless statement than in the printed lesson. When a book is written in question and answer, questions have to be inserted here and there for the sole purpose of connecting one part with another in meaning; and when the

child's mental habits are being formed by the use of question-less text-books in other branches, the questions in the Catechism seem foreign and confusing. But the chief gain I take to be this, that the teacher is thrown on his own resources and must ask, not cut-and-dried questions, but questions addressed to the intelligence of the pupils. Of course, for the benefit of the less skilful or the more hurried teacher, a few suggestive questions might be printed separately at the end of each lesson. I leave it to some one better informed to tell us whether the time has come to relieve the child of that part of the Catechism which properly belongs to the teacher, namely, the questions. In a work on pedagogy I find the following:

> The object of putting questions to a child whom we are instructing may be:
>
> 1. To find out what he knows by way of preparing him for some further instruction.
> 2. To discover his misconceptions and difficulties.
> 3. To secure the activity of his mind and his coöperation while you are teaching him.
> 4. To test the result and outcome of what you have taught.

Questions learned by heart in the Catechism do not come under any of these heads. But they do make a good teacher's work more difficult. In many cases they are the questions which he would naturally ask in a living way if he were not precluded by the fact that, since the child already knows them by heart, he cannot see any exercise of intelligence in the answers. He must therefore invent variations, and this effort tends to make the departure from the text too great for the child's mind. They rob the teacher of one of his resources.

It may be urged against this, that there are many parents who teach their own children, and that therefore the Catechism should not be modified with a view to its use in class-work only. But nowadays parents know a good deal about school work. They passed through the schools themselves. And parental love has a wonderful pedagogy of its own. There are many mothers who have never been instructed in the art of teaching, but are nevertheless excellent instructors of their own children. Most parents would find no difficulty in asking the simple questions which a Catechism lesson suggests.

TEACHER.

CHURCH MUSIC.

The Roman periodical, the *Rassegna Gregoriana,* established in 1902 for the study of Liturgy and the Church Chant, soon attained the highest distinction (which it has since maintained) as a most scholarly exponent of all subjects connected with the Sacred Liturgy, especially in the domain of research and of archeology. Among its most notable features has been its "Bibliografia delle discipline liturgiche," the collaborators in this department including J. Wickham Legg, F. S. S. (London), who covers the field of English current literature; the Rev. Aurelio Palmieri, O. S. A., that of Greek, Russian, Roumanian, and Bulgarian literature; the Rev. Canon Grospellier, that of French; the Rev. Prof. Dr. Hermann Mueller (Paderborn), that of German (in part); the Rev. Dr. Mercati, Dom P. de Meester, O. S. B., and the Rev. Angelo Santi, (of the *Civiltà Cattolica*), the remaining fields of current literature. As a result of the comprehensive survey thus secured, the "Bibliografia" is a mine of information on current aspects of liturgical study such as is found in no other periodical; and it is almost an education, in this branch of sacred study, merely to glance over the carefully categorized references found in the "Bibliografia."

We think it will be of interest to the readers of the ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW to learn that we have made arrangements with the publishers of the *Rassegna Gregoriana* to secure proof sheets in advance of the "Bibliografia," for inclusion in our periodical of CHURCH MUSIC. The critiques of the inclusions in the "Bibliografia" we shall have translated into English for our readers. In addition to this, the many topics of current interest in the special domain of Liturgical Music, which, in view of the recent legislation in this matter, receive ample space in the *Rassegna,* will similarly be translated (or condensed) into English for the readers of CHURCH MUSIC, and will appear, so far as it is possible to assure this, in English simultaneously with the appearance in the *Rassegna* of the Italian and French originals. Mean-

while, the other features of CHURCH MUSIC will be retained in that periodical; so that, while the field of subjects of special practical interest to English readers will remain adequately covered as heretofore, the scope will be broadened and the interest of the periodical will be increased by the inclusion of much matter of more general interest, but all within the domain of the liturgy of the Church, and especially of that portion which deals with the musical necessities of our choirs.

The subscription price of CHURCH MUSIC will not, however, be increased. It is our hope to present to its readers a magazine covering adequately the ground mapped out for itself, so that English readers will possess, at the most moderate cost, a periodical of eminence in its chosen field. A year's subscription ($1.50) will display the value of the magazine and indicate more fully than can be pointed out in this brief manner, the character of the magazine. In the scholarly distinction of its contributions, in the typographical elegance of its make-up, in the profusion of its musical illustration, and in the large supplement (96 pages each year, royal octavo size) of appropriate music furnished, it is simply stating the truth to say that no periodical in any language approaches the fullness and eminence of CHURCH MUSIC in its own field.

Ecclesiastical Library Table.

RECENT BIBLE STUDY.

I. Relation of the New Syllabus to Bible Study. In the opening paragraph of the Decree, known as the New Syllabus, condemning the sixty-five erroneous propositions, the Eminent Fathers of the Holy Office say: "These errors will be all the more pernicious when they affect sacred disciplines, the interpretation of the Sacred Scripture, the principal mysteries of the Faith." We have therefore the open avowal of the authors of the New Syllabus that the errors condemned therein refer to Biblical exegesis. It is true that on reading the list of errors themselves, one cannot help realizing that the underlying principle is the idea of universal evolution. The supernatural element is not merely minimized, but actually taken away from the world; the universe is left to its own resources, to its own natural development. The religious world is no exception to this general law. What wonder, then, if the student of religion, according to the words of a recent writer, brings us back to a Jesus without a Christ, to a Christ without his Godhead, to a God without a Church, and to a Church without dogma. The modern errors condemned by the Congregation of the Holy Office do not repeat any definite form of past heresies; they indeed repeat all the past heresies, but they combine them into one.

The list of the errors condemned by the recent Decree of the Holy Office is a combination of all past heresies into one; still, it refers in a particular way to the modern method of Bible study. The admission of the principle of evolution into any particular branch of learning does not destroy that special branch: history remains history, though it be treated in the light of evolutionary development; zoology remains zoology; philosophy remains philosophy. In the same way, Bible study

remains Bible study, though the contents of the two Testaments be forced into the artificial form of natural development by means of certain *a priori* principles of Biblical criticism. The attentive reader will find that the various propositions of the New Syllabus either express the principle of natural development, or they state certain *a priori* principles of Biblical criticism, or again they proclaim the result of the critical adjustment of the New Testament to the theory of development.

A number of logical results following from the application of the theory of development to certain portions of the Bible in accordance with the dictates of certain false principles of Biblical criticism have been condemned in the propositions of the New Syllabus. Not that all the false results of the modern Biblical critics have been enumerated; the Eminent Fathers of the Holy Office have been very considerate in their selection. The four recent decisions of the Biblical Commission, e. g. except part of what concerns the Fourth Gospel, have found no place in the Syllabus. It is only the more deadly conclusions of the Biblical critics that have been rejected. Nor is it to be understood that all the errors condemned by the Holy Office have been equally diffused through the whole Church. In France they were represented by Loisy and his adherents; in Italy, by such publications as *Il Santo*, the *Studi Religiosi*, and *Rinnovamento*; in Germany by the so-called *Reform-Katholicismus* under the leadership of Schell, the secret international league against the *Index*, and one or another Review, the *Hochland*, e. g.; in England, too, the new errors were represented to a certain extent, at least, by the pseudo-Newmanites who amplified the development-theory to an extent which their great patron had never intended.

II. The New Syllabus as a Danger Signal. The words of the Decree of the Holy Office are replete with warnings against the new errors; still, the reader is impressed with two monitions as standing out prominent in the array of condemned propositions. The first is a warning against disregard for the doctrinal decisions of the Church, and the second is a warning against too high an esteem for non-ecclesiastical science.

1. Just as subjection to the *magisterium* of the Church is the essential characteristic of a true Catholic, so does modernism regard a contemptuous feeling for the doctrinal authority of the Church as the first mark of its followers. There are several ways of concealing this contempt and of avoiding an open break with the teaching of the ecclesiastical authority. The Abbé Houtin, e. g. points out [1] how Loisy under the pseudonyms of Isidore Després and Firmin inverted the real meaning of the Encyclical *Providentissimus Deus,* though it would be absurd to imagine that the learned writer had any doubt as to its true meaning. Another method of avoiding an open clash with the *magisterium* of the Church is suggested by the *Zwanzigste Jahrhundert* (1903, 315) and the *Renaissance* (1901, 224; 1902, 256): Let the advanced student keep the sacred fire till the coming of better times; at no price let him who has reached a higher intellectual level, surrender his attainments, and descend to a lower plain. Professor Schell's letters to Salvisberg, Hauviller, Nippold, and others, are a practical application of this second method of avoiding ecclesiastical entanglements. A third method is suggested in certain recent articles published by professors of theology: the Holy Father is to be approached by way of diplomacy in order to teach him how he must deal with advanced thinkers; or let all truly national Catholics unite against the undue interference on the part of the teaching authority of the Church. Need we remind the reader of the fourth method, which consists in yielding obedience only to *ex-cathedra* definitions and setting aside all the doctrinal decrees of the Congregations as mere theological opinions?

In opposition to this spirit of insubordination, the Holy Office condemns in the first four propositions of the new Syllabus the attempts at exempting the science of Biblical exegesis from the domain of the doctrinal authority of the Church. In the following four propositions the Holy Office maintains that in a certain respect it pertains to the Church to pass judg-

[1] La question biblique au XIX^e. siècle, p. 259 f.

ment even on the assertions of human sciences; that the Church teaching (*Ecclesia docens*) does more in its definitions than merely sanction the opinions of the Church learning (*Ecclesia discens*); that, moreover, the Church can exact from the faithful an internal assent to its doctrinal decrees; that, finally, the condemnations passed by the Congregation of the Index or by other Roman Congregations cannot be treated as of no weight.

2. The second warning of the recent Decree of the Holy Office is directed against overestimating the profane sciences. This danger manifests itself first in the study of non-Catholic and even infidel books in preference to works written by good Catholic students. It has been said of Loisy's writings that they produce the impression that their author is better acquainted with the works of Harnack, Wellhausen, Holtzmann, and of other rationalists, than with the works of the Fathers of the Church. Secondly, the danger shows itself in the application to Catholic theology of principles which, however questionable in themselves, have gained a temporary admission into our profane sciences. In consequence, Biblical exegesis is changed into a merely philological textual criticism; dogmatic theology, into a merely historical criticism of our dogmas; moral theology, into a mere course of ethics following the lead of Kantian autonomy. A third way in which the same danger shows itself is the quiet ignoring on the part of some modern writers of the weakness and extreme fallibility of our natural branches of learning. Our foremost scientists are very careful, when they treat of scientific subjects, to distinguish clearly between mere hypotheses and certain results. Some of them even speak of the relativity of all knowledge, thus preparing the way for a more or less complete scepticism. Only in their struggle against theology and the Church do they forget the uncertainty of their assumptions. They endeavor to pass off as indubitable results of scientific investigation views and opinions which in scientific works are scarcely regarded as workable hypotheses.

The Holy Office condemns the very foundations of this in-

tellectual pride and independence. The Decree *Lamentabili* denies that the Church's interpretation of the Sacred Books is subject to the judgment and the correction of the exegetes (Proposit. 2); that the critic may reject facts which the Church holds as most certain truths (Proposit. 23); that the progress of science requires a remodeling of the conceptions of Christian doctrine concerning God, Creation, Revelation, the Person of the Incarnate Word, and Redemption (Proposit. 64); that modern Catholicism cannot be reconciled with true science, unless it be transformed into a non-dogmatic Christianity, that is, into a broad and liberal Protestantism (Proposit. 65). Finally, in order to block up the broad way which seems to tempt most of our Catholic Bible students into the danger of modernism, the Holy Office again rejects the error that heterodox exegetes have expressed the true sense of the Scriptures more faithfully than the Catholic exegetes (Proposit. 19).

III. The New Syllabus as a Source of Light. The careless reader of the Decree *Lamentabili* may be tempted to regard it as a mere collection of modern errors, of itself impotent to send forth any light. But on serious reflection we shall find that it adds to our positive knowledge in a threefold way:

1. If my tourist guide tells me of successive patches of darkness that they are darkness, he does not thereby change them into light. But owing to the magic power of Logic, if my intellectual guide tells me that a series of propositions are false, he tells me formally, implicitly, that their contradictories are true. He changes, as it were, intellectual darkness into light. In the present case, the Holy Office is our intellectual guide; it enumerates sixty-five propositions and condemns them as false. It informs us, therefore, that their contradictories are true.

2. The new Syllabus teaches me sixty-five truths. They are not new truths; the Church has given expression to most, or to all, of them before; but these old truths were denied under new forms. And these new forms were often so vague and deceptive that the simple faithful might be misled by them.

Thus far, the enemy often fought with his face masked; the new Syllabus forces him to unmask and to show himself. The past proceeding of the modernists is the more remarkable, as they claim for themselves all the credit of good faith, sincerity, and uprightness, telling their readers, at least by implication, that their opponents are not sincere, even if they be not manifest prevaricators. The reader remembers that these tactics provoked M. Brunetière's famous article entitled "La Fâcheuse Equivoque." The modernists employ the terms consecrated by ages, but they give them a new meaning; it is important for the modernists that the great body of the faithful should not understand their juggling with terms. After the Holy Office had issued its first censure on Loisy's doctrines, the *Times* (20 January, 1904) had an article contributed by *Vidi*. The writer gave a pretended synopsis of Loisy's teaching, in order to discredit the authority of the Holy Office. And what was Loisy's teaching? He held certain opinions on the formation of the Pentateuch, on the first chapters of Genesis, on the historical character of several books of the Bible, on the development of religious doctrine in the Old Testament, on the scientific statements in the Bible, and on the real reference to the Church in the New Testament. A few days later (25 January), *Catholicus* answered *Vidi* by a series of questions: Does Loisy teach that Christ was not conscious of being true God, consubstantial with the Father? that Christ did not teach the doctrine of expiation? that the Catholic Church, as an organized body, has no place in the consciousness, the teaching, and the designs of Christ? that Christ did not institute the Supper as a rite of the New Law to be kept for ever? that the Resurrection is not historically true? The trick of *Vidi* was undone; another writer, *Romanus*, answered the article of *Catholicus*, granting him that Loisy taught the doctrines implied in the five questions. *Catholicus* had accomplished his purpose for sincere Catholics: it is enough to see the presence of heresy; they avoid it instinctively.

3. The new Syllabus teaches sixty-five truths and tears off

the mask from modernism, exposing it as the summary of all former heresies. But it does still more. About the middle of last century, the rationalists were full of sarcasm against the Catholic Church, because the Church insisted on the limits of human reason and the existence of real mysteries. At the time of the Vatican Council it was found necessary to define the truth that human reason is able to arrive at the knowledge of the existence of a God; but the new Syllabus finds it necessary to insist on the fact that human reason can know anything at all. The fifty-eighth proposition condemns the statement: "Truth is not any more immutable than man himself, since it is evolved with him, in him, and through him." Modernism has pronounced its own death warrant in the teaching of Kant, its favorite Doctor: there is an impassable abyss, we are told, between reality and the mind. It has become the task of the Catholic Church to defend the world against scepticism, and to restore its innate dignity to the human mind.

Criticisms and Notes.

S. JEAN CHRYSOSTOME ET SES ŒUVRES DANS L'HISTOIRE LITTERAIRE. Essai présenté à l'occasion du XV centenaire de S. Jean Chrysostome par Dom Chr. Baur, O. S. B., Doct. en Sciences Morales et Historiques. (Université de Louvain: "Conferences d' histoire et de philologie.") Louvain: Bureaux du Recueil, 36 rue de Beriot. Paris: Albert Fontemoing. 1907. Pp. 311. Price, 5 francs.

On the 13 November the Greek Church celebrates the fifteenth centenary of St. John Chrysostom. It records the anniversary of his return from his first exile, an event in which the popular Christian instinct found more reason for rejoicing than either in his birth or in his glorious death on 14 September, 407 A. D., which occurred whilst he was being dragged from the prison in Cucusus to that of Pitysus on the shores of the Euxine. There are few lives of holy bishops whose records have come to us from those early days, that are so full of practical lessons and touching instances of devotion to duty as that of the great metropolitan of Constantinople. Of all the sterling qualities that mark him as a true priest and a valiant defender of the interests of the flock entrusted to his care, his gift of preaching was perhaps the least worthy of admiration—remarkable as it must have been, since it gained for him the name of "Orpheus of eloquence," which St. Isidore of Plusium bestows on him, and which posterity has accepted as his permanent title of distinction among the Fathers of the Church. The name "Chrysostom," which a later generation accorded him, as Dom Baur's erudite disquisition shows, is the result of the appreciation of his writings much more than of his spoken discourses. A study therefore of the works of the Saint, from the literary point of view, such as our learned Benedictine takes, is of distinct value in securing a true estimate of St. Chrysostom's influence, all the more since the author goes into the sources of these writings, the occasions which called them forth, the circumstances which influenced and shaped their treatment, and the forces that contributed to their acting upon the public mind. Dom Baur's treatise was originally intended to form simply an introduction to a larger biography of the Saint,

as a worthy record to be published in connexion with the centenary celebration this year at Rome, where the body of the holy bishop is kept. But the material grew under the hand of the industrious and critical author, so as to demand a broader treatment; and this induced the directors of the Faculty of Philosophy and Letters at the University of Louvain to issue the work as a separate volume; and indeed the book may be regarded as a biography complete in its way and unique as picturing to us St. Chrysostom predominantly as a writer.

The chief value, however, of the work is in its bibliographical, and particularly its critically literary, character. The author leads us into the study of St. Chrysostom's influence as a writer in the Greek and the Latin Church. He shows what place in theological literature his writings occupy, and how they came to attain it—gradually, amid opposition from the Alexandrian school, and the varying attitudes of the followers of Origen, the leaders in the controversy of the "Three Chapters," the advocates of monotheism and iconoclasm. With the ninth century the Greek mind begins to see in St. Chrysostom the model not only of style for the preacher, but likewise of exegesis. He is the prince of interpreters as well as of orators in the best sense of the word.

When the influence of Greek letters and culture made itself felt in the West, beginning with the Carlovingian period, St. Chrysostom's works were among the first to be studied, cited, and translated. By the twelfth century he had become a byword of the masters in the schools. St. Thomas of Aquin tells us that he would rather have the commentary of St. Chrysostom on Matthew than all the wealth of Paris, and we find him continually quoting from the Saint's works, especially in the *Catena aurea*. The same may be said of St. Bonaventure and others of equal eminence as teachers in the medieval schools.

Probably the most helpful part of Dr. Baur's labor for students of the Saint's works is that portion of his volume in which he discusses the critical value of the manuscript treasures and various editions of St. Chrysostom's writings. This covers not only Greek and Latin, but also other foreign editions, notably German.

As distinct from this must be noted the historiography in both the Greek and the Latin Church, where we find an immense store of references to sources of biography and to biographies, chronicles, panegyrics in prose and verse. Considerable attention is de-

voted to notices concerning the liturgical cult given to the Saint in the Eastern and Western communities. The volume concludes with a survey of the various works discussing the teaching of St. Chrysostom as philosopher, dogmatic theologian, and moral and spiritual writer. Although we have not been able to enter upon a critical estimate of the details into which P. Baur leads his readers, we are quite assured that the work eminently deserves the attention of all serious students of the great Saint and theologian of the universal Church, the celebration of whose fifteenth centenary should bring a revival of zeal for patristic study among us.

THE LEGENDS OF THE SAINTS. An Introduction to Hagiography. From the French of Père H. Delehaye, S. J., Bollandist. Translated by Mrs. V. M. Crawford. New York, London, Bombay and Calcutta: Longmans, Green and Co. 1907. Pp. 241.

Legends are a very useful element in education when they illustrate some truth by which the mind is enabled to appreciate virtue or high motive. For thus the will through the imagination is aroused to aspire to what is noble and praiseworthy, and accordingly all fiction which presents to the young heroic images, even though they have no counterpart in actual history, aid the development of superior character. Hence the question of historicity is one that is of subordinate consideration in our estimate of the educational value of a story or narrative. In this way the legends of the saints exercise their influence for good upon the mind and heart of the reader, even when he erroneously believes that to be a fact which is merely a parable. It matters not whether he who tells the parable meant it to be understood as a fact or whether he himself so considered it. The lesson lies in the image, not in the historical fact which it assumes to express; and as we can find in a picture the spur to chivalrous action, just as if we had before us the living example, so we may look in a legend for the incentive to the good which it describes to us as if it were a reality. In this way legends have done their work for good in the literature and art by which popular faith and zeal sought to perpetuate heroic motives and actions, real or fanciful, in the lives of the saints; and the Church, not exercising the office of critic where the heart was being warmed to virtue, allowed these legends to pass current in the circle of her simple-minded chil-

dren until the time might come when the adult intelligence of a later age should inquire into their historical value. Now that the age of awakened inquiry is upon us, we do what the parent does with his child when it has grown to youthful maturity and is capable of understanding that the stories of yesterday were but incentives to the endeavors of the morrow: we revise the old legends and teach rather by facts than by parables or fiction, giving meat where before milk served the life-growing power.

But there is a weakness in human kind that loves to hold fast to what it has once learned to prize. As some men keep their boyhood hobbies, and some women coddle their girlish pets through life, because they are to them memories of happy days, full of delusions, yet full of real joys also, so devout persons who have a love for detail and have grown into making realities of what is written for their edification, feel a reluctance to recognize criticism when it interferes with their beautiful beliefs. Unfortunately, not everything that might be true in the lives of the saints can be shown to rest on fact, though that does not detract from their real sanctity. Hero-worship is quite a common inheritance, and its possession has influenced, unduly and to the detriment of historical accuracy, many a pious writer who wanted everybody else to share his admiration for the saint whom, like an honored relative, he claimed as his own, and greater than other saints not so close to his family-tree or patriotic shrine. Thus manifold exaggerations, the fruits of credulity or vanity, have crept into what we would like to be simple history, though it must be, perforce, also panegyric. Again, ignorance or half-learning, assuming the rôle of exponent of inscriptions and interpreter of names that had to do with saints, has caused much confusion, which the imagination and inventive genius of later days have sought to explain, thereby only adding to the misleading elements of the story.

All this Father Delehaye explains to us, tracing many commonplace errors, in an interesting and convincing way, regarding some popular saint or pious belief in things extraordinary which we read about as attested miracles, but which are only imaginings of pious writers, whose piety need not have suffered any more than that of their readers, if only the authors had been more accurate in their statements or better informed, or less credulous or vain.

The volume, in a way, throws light upon the psychology of the

saints, as it does assuredly upon the psychology of their biographers, old and recent. We are not only instructed in the manner in which legends of saints have frequently developed into unreal descriptions of their persons and acts, but we also learn how the history of holy men and women ought to be written to conform to the purpose of a true model of imitation as well as wisdom.

The author, apart from this practical purpose, gives us a systematic classification of hagiographic texts; illustrates his theory of utilizing documents, and of discriminating between the spurious and the genuine. The last chapter but one is eminently valuable for purposes of apologetic work, inasmuch as it lights up the connexion between the traditions carried over from paganism into Christianity as a concession to the weakness of the very nature which the writer illustrates. At the same time it sharply distinguishes between the exaggerated or assumed translations and borrowings from pagan cult upon which rationalists so much insist, and the adaptations, coincidences, and unavoidable analogies which the transition to Christian living called for.

BRAIN AND PERSONALITY. By W. H. Thomson, M.D., LL.D. New York: Dodd, Mead and Co. 1907. Pp. 320.

Among the many books dealing with the physical basis of the mind, or rather, the soul, the present volume deserves a place of distinction. The author, a prominent physician in New York, and formerly a professor at the University of that city, writes from the fullness of practical experience as well as of theoretical study. In consulting books that profess to describe the nervous system the reader is often so bewildered by structural details that he is unable to see the woods for the trees. On the other hand, he finds so much metaphysics—and that, too, of a very indifferent sort—commingled with anatomy and physiology that his attention is drained in the effort to separate the speculative introjections from the actual facts. He will be confronted by neither of these obstacles in the present work. Dr. Thomson has happily succeeded in keeping to the middle way. His book is neither overpacked with technicalities nor attenuated by speculation. What it imports the educated reader to know concerning the brain and its nerve inlets and outlets is here, and the inferences from cere-

bral functioning are eminently sane as well as practical. From the plane of physiology the author points out the distinction of what he calls "the Personality, the Ego," from the brain. The localization of the various psychical functions in different convolutions of the cerebral cortex is due, he shows, to the special physiological training imparted to those areas by an agent that is distinct from the brain. The relationship between the latter organ and the mind is not like that of the Æolian harp to its wind-stirred strains, but rather like the violin to the master artist. Sleep, too, with its mysterious cessation of consciousness, and awakening with its equally inexplicable revival of consciousness, bear witness to "the otherness" of the mind from the body, while the purpose of sleep, which Dr. Thomson conclusively proves to be not, as many suppose, the mere repair of muscular or even motor-nervous tissue, but the relievance of the strain produced by the continued subjection of the brain to the will's control, corroborates the same testimony.

There is nothing, of course, novel in this doctrine; it is just the verdict of "common sense" in the terminology of science. It is, moreover, the fundamental position of "the old psychology" strengthened by the observation and experimentation of the newer physiology. None the less is the book serviceable, because it presents the evidence in convenient shape and with the added stimulus that comes from the author's narrative of personal experience, as well as from his clear and graphic style. Besides this, the practical hints suggested by cerebral physiology will be found useful, especially by those engaged in the work of education.

THE DIOCESE OF FORT WAYNE: 1857—1907. A Book of Historical Reference: 1669—1907. By the Right Rev. H. J. Alerding. 1907. Pp. 541.

It is fortunate for the students of our missionary history that in most instances the published records of Catholic civilization in America have come from writers within the Church who to a conscientious sense of responsibility could add that peculiar intellectual discernment which gives a supernatural as well as a practical turn to their literary efforts. Bishop Alerding does not pretend to exceptional literary powers; his object is to record with accuracy facts as he has been enabled to collect them. Nevertheless his style is pleasingly clear and smooth where he

does not merely quote. The collection of the matter itself is due, next to his own industry, to the kindly coöperation of the priests of the diocese, many of whom furnished data which otherwise must have escaped the author, notably in the matter of personal biography. The story of the diocese of Vincennes, published by our author nearly twenty-five years ago, furnishes a sort of background to his accounts of early Christian settlements in Indiana; and although that city became the center of a diocese only in 1834, its rule covered the entire State of Indiana and part of Illinois. The see of Fort Wayne was to be created twenty-three years later, in 1857.

In chronological order the author describes the development of Church life in the northern half of Indiana which at that time comprised the newly-established diocese. The first of its four bishops, John Henry Luers, died in 1871, suddenly after conferring Orders in Cleveland. He was succeeded by Bishop Dwenger, a man remarkable for many gifts of intellect, but more so for his charity toward the orphan and the poor. The next incumbent was the Right Rev. Joseph Rademacher, who had come to America as a boy and had been ordained by Bishop Luers in 1863. He served in difficult missions, Attica, Covington, and Marshfield; later in Columbus City and Fort Wayne. In 1883 he was appointed to the see of Nashville, where his zeal for the sick during the yellow-fever visitation won him the name of "good Bishop R." Ten years later he was transferred to Fort Wayne, the scene of his early labor. Then follows Bishop Herman Joseph, the author of the work, who outlines his own missionary activity in a simple and objective way. Next in order the history of the parishes, with biographical sketches of their founders and incumbents, is detailed; then, the foundations and activities of the different religious communities, beginning with that of the Holy Cross, are recorded. Separate chapters are devoted to the history of the various charitable institutions of the diocese; and an excellent review of the educational work done in the diocese is given from the pen of the Rev. A. E. Lafontaine, Diocesan Superintendent of Schools. The volume is a handsome addition, from reliable sources, to the history of the Catholic Church in America.

TIRONIBUS. Commonplace Advice to Church Students. By Harold Henry Mure. St. Louis, Mo.: B. Herder : London : Sands and Co. 1907. Pp. 77.

We would recommend this little book to all seminarists and to not a few priests. It contains pointed and well-selected suggestions which the youth who learns his profession in the world has opportunities of picking up, but which the church student, for one reason or another, lacks. To the latter, nevertheless, these suggestions are at least as necessary as to his secular contemporary—scraps of knowledge about health, conduct, reading, and business. The style and printing are in excellent form, making it pleasant as well as profitable reading for odd moments.

Literary Chat.

The reiterated reversion of human thought to ancestral types is one of the commonplaces of experience. The occurrence, or rather, the recurrence, however, is not quite like its biological analogue. Atavism is the reappearance of a preceding type just as it was, unmodified by the evolutionary process. Not so with the recurrence of the thought-type. The latter has more in common with the repetitions into which human history is said to fall. Neither the mental type nor the historical event recurs in quite the original form. Both are modified in the transition; both, too, are changed by their new environment.

Thus we find a recent writer in a work on cerebral physiology, noticed elsewhere in these pages, reviving a doctrine that had long ago been laid aside by the new psychology as either untrue or useless — the doctrine, namely, of a controlling principle dwelling within the human organism and really distinct therefrom. Dr. Thomson, it is true, does not use the Aristotelian categories "substance," "form," etc., to characterize that principle; mind, will, personality, the Ego, are his substitutes. Nevertheless these agencies do the duty of those. They control, direct, discipline, the nervous organism, and thereby specifically determine the man. Of course this always was, and is, the most elementary teaching of Catholic philosophy, but it is significant at least of its vitality to meet it reasserted and reconfirmed by the newest book on physiology.

On the other hand, the doctrine has undergone a change in its resuscitated form. With Dr. Thomson, "Mind" and "Will" ("Personality," "Ego") are distinct, or rather, different principles of action; whereas with Catholic philosophers they are but different forms of energy—faculty—resulting from the same unifying principle, the soul. The change, moreover, it will be noticed, is not for the better, since it introduces into man's

being an extreme dualism, which, to say the least, is not in harmony with experience.

The recent physical speculations as to the ultimate constitution of matter appear to be a reversion to another ancient theory. And certainly if, what so many are coming to think, the radical constituents of matter are of the same specific nature, and the differentiations of bodies can be explained by variations of position and motion, we should have a revival of what looks very much like the *materia prima* of the Schoolmen—the homogeneous undifferentiated subject of all bodies.

Here, too, however, the reversion is not complete, or the revived type has been changed. For whatever may be the radical elements of the material world, they must possess some real differentiation, something inherent whereby they would be actually set off from a possible other, and in this very definiteness they would not be the *materia prima* of the scholastics, which was "neque quid, neque quale, neque quantum, neque aliquid ex quibus ens determinatur." It is well to notice this fact, and not to proclaim too loudly that the new theory is precisely the same as, even though similar to, the old.

For the rest, those who are interested in the recent hypotheses concerning the ultimate constitution of matter will find a graphic account thereof in Mr. Fournier's volume *The Electron Theory* (Longmans, 1906). The mathematical formulas may at first puzzle the uninitiated, but the concluding chapter on electrical dimensions will probably help them out. The author carries his speculations on the electron theory much deeper and higher in a more recent book entitled *Two New Worlds: The Infra-World and Supra-World* (Longmans, 1907). He pictures "the atom" as a minute sun around which whirl the electrons like so many planets. Reducing mass, time, velocity, proportionately, he carries out the analogy between this infra-world and the upper solar and stellar universe with wonderful ingenuity and interest. The field is, of course, one wherein "the scientific imagination" may easily run mad and leap the hedges. Mr. Fournier, however, keeps fairly within the fences which mathematics set up. Occasionally, it is true, he breaks bounds, as where he takes a "glimpse of our starry heavens as they appeared a trillion years ago" (p. 148), and where he speaks of "the eternity of the universe" (*ibid.*). Moreover, when he says that "we can never arrive at anything ultimate by making our unit smaller — there will always be something a million times smaller, infinitely smaller"—we must suppose that he is not quite within the lines of objective facts. But apart from a few more such extravagances—assignable to the writer's *élan*—the book is instructive, while the general conception, the analogies, and the vivid style give it the fascination of romance. For whilst it appeals, indeed, as the author himself says, "to the intellect in the first instance," nevertheless "the proof of the existence of two worlds whose possibility was barely suspected hitherto and whose connexion with ourselves, with our own past and future may be very intimate, must also stir the heart and fire the imagination." While avoiding "theological controversy," he nevertheless expresses the "hope

that those who believe that this world is in good hands, that it is not governed by blind chance or inflexible destiny, that it offers infinite possibilities of faith and hope and love, will derive some additional comfort and encouragement" from his pages—a sentiment to which the reader will surely respond, as he likewise will to this, that "the circumstances of the book being written in Ireland and largely inspired by Irish thoughts and thinkers may go to justify its Irish motto: 'For the Glory of God and the Honor of Ireland'" (p. vii).

The October number of *The Month* (London) presents a singularly attractive series of articles. Among these there is a notable paper by Father Herbert Thurston, in which he directs attention to the superior merit of William De Morgan's work as a writer of fiction. Little, if anything, appears to be known in the literary world of Mr. De Morgan's identity, except that within the last two years the English publisher Heinemann has issued two novels by him—*Joseph Vance* and *Alice-For-Short*. The former sets before us the career of a boy raised by education above his humble surroundings, and morally elevated, not spoiled, in the process; the other affords a companion study of a girl who enjoys a similar experience as the result of a different combination of circumstances. Father Thurston thinks—and there are few better judges—that within the last twenty years no new author has come forward who has a better claim to a place in the very first rank of novelists than Mr. De Morgan.

A short paper *Mynheer Pastoor* in the same monthly will particularly interest the clergy. The old "Pastoor" is a man who would be called "ancient" by the progressive clergy of the present generation. But he was very solid, and there was little to complain of in his parish as regards contentment and sobriety and homely virtue. He had fifty-two sermons for fifty-two Sundays, and if, after some years of repetition, the quicker minds got them by heart, it was no loss. "Once true, always true," thought the Pastoor, and "What is heard often is not so soon forgotten."

Pastoor van Looyen was fond of the children. To them he devoted his constant care. He took nearly all the Catechism classes *himself*, the first communicants being his particular care. Catechism instruction was his *forte;* he excelled in imparting Christian doctrine to young minds; none of his scholars grew up with misty ideas on religion. He was severe in class, and claimed strict attention, but only to beam on his young friends with greater indulgence in playtime. The Pastoor was fond of music and had a fine church choir.

In all his hospitable duties Mynheer Pastoor was ably seconded by his housekeeper, that is, in the material part, for her manner was not always propitiatory. Hannah was a lady of ample girth and conical shape, the apex being represented by the tight knot into which she twisted her hair, and the base by her multitudinous skirts. Among her special titles to good fame was this, that she was a good cook and was intensely loyal to her